# The New REPUBLIC

## A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1920 NUMBER 280


## Contents


The Week ..... 193
Leading Editorials
Hoover's Chances ..... 196
Money to Nominate ..... 198
The Use of the Treaty Impasse ..... 199
Up to the Voters ..... 200
The Coal Award ..... 202
General Articles
The Logic of Lowden ..... Walter Lippmann 204
Strawinsky ..... Paul Rosenfeld 207
Keynes and His Critics ..... Alvin Johnson 211
Learn From Passaic ..... William Hard 213
Who Are the Conscientious Objectors? ..... Winthrop D. Lane ..... 215
Centralia ..... E. M. 217
Correspondence ..... 221
Reviews of Books
Chekhov's Letters ..... F. H. 226
The History of India ..... Lajpat Rai 227
The Origin of Consciousness ..... R. F. A. H. 228
The Morass East of the Rhine ..... Alvin Johnson 230
State Control ..... L. M. 231


## The Week

FRENCH militarism, like the German militarism of 1914, cares not a fig for the public opinion of the world. It seizes upon an inexcusably loosely drawn provision of the Treaty of Versailles as a pretext for seizing German cities on the east bank of the Rhine, and for the planting of forces at points from which it is easy to command the heart of industrial Germany. It seizes upon this pretext at a time when the struggle between the forces of order and the forces of disorder in Germany are about evenly balanced, and when the inevitable result of French action is to tip the scales toward disorder. England and Italy advise against such action; America is against it; the whole neutral world looks on with apprehension. What is that to the French militarists? They have a powerful army, Germany is prostrate. And if the Germans should rise in desperation nothing would stand in the way of French annexation of the left bank of the Rhine and the permanent occupation of the Ruhr districts. At last the French would have attained the goal of a Germany broken and helpless as after the Thirty Years War. Is such a result possible? There is an influential body of French opinion that holds it is not only possible, but that only firmness is needed to make it inevitable.

OUR innocents abroad, who helped to draw up a Treaty full of elastic clauses and blank checks in the fond delusion that all the victors intended to exercise their powers of life and death over Germany in a humane, common sense spirit will now explain volubly that the whole trouble arises from our failure to sign. If we had signed, the French militarists would still have regarded the Germans as the eternal enemy. They would still have joined forces with the French ruling politicians, who know that there is no practicable way of making the budget balance and that operations across the Rhine can alone stave off the evil day of financial reckoning. It is not inevitable that the politicians and militarists will have their way. But the check upon their action is not the suasion of signatories to the Treaty but the good sense of the French people, who must sooner or later awaken to the dangers of a policy that threatens to leave France as morally isolated as Germany ever was.

BY concessions and by the occasional application of force, the German government appears to be gaining ground on the revolutionary forces. It may come through, weakened in the sense that it has yielded to insurgent pressure, but strengthened by the accession of elements both from the left and from the right, which have come to see that the present government, with all its defects, is better than any practical alternative. Apparently the chief menace to the stability of the government lies in the international situation. French occupation of territory east of the Rhine might easily produce a wave of patriotic feeling that would sweep away a government whose policies did not avert this new affront to the national feeling.


LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE are still at war with Germany, because we have not signed the Treaty of Versailles. If we had signed, however, Germany would now be in a state of war with us. According to Part III, Section III, Article 43 of the Treaty, Germany is forbidden to maintain or assemble armed forces "either permanently or temporarily" within a line drawn fifty kilometers to the east of the Rhine. Section 44 reads: "In case Germany violates in any manner whatever the provisions of Articles 42 and 43, she shall be regarded as committing a hostile act against the Powers signatory to the present Treaty and as calculated to disturb the peace of the world." Germany has actually sent armed forces into this zone, to put down insurrection. If we were a Power signatory to the Treaty, Germany would then be committing a hostile act against us. True, we might ignore such hostilities, if we chose, but sooner or later they would get on our nerves.

THOUGH America might choose to ignore what is after all only a technical violation, justified in the eyes of most Americans by the necessity of putting down red revolution, France would no more ignore it, if America were a signatory, than she does now when America is not. The French government claims the right to act alone, without the assent of the other signatories, to meet what she pleases to consider a menace to her safety. If the policy of coercion should produce dangerous consequences, France would expect the other signatories to come to her relief. They are morally bound to do so, under the Treaty. We should have been bound to support France, whatever our opinion of her provocative policy, if we had signed, even with ten times as many reservations to the Covenant as have been proposed.

FLENSBORG is in the second zone into which Slesvig had been divided for purposes of the plebiscite. The whole zone, but Flensborg most decisively, voted to remain German. On what principle, then, could the Danish crown base its claim to the annexation of Flensborg? The Treaty of Versailles prescribes that in the first zone the result shall turn on the vote of the zone as a whole; in the second zone the vote shall be by communes, and the national boundary shall be fixed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers "according to the line based on the result of the voting" and "taking into account the particular geographical and economic conditions of the localities in question." Economically and geographically the commercial city of Flensborg would be a desirable acquisition for Denmark, according to the nationalistic views of the crown. But the plain people of Denmark seem not to want a city that prefers to remain German.

ACCORDING to a special cable to the World, published April 4th, the Russian republic's requirements of medical commodities were met, last December, up to only six per cent on the average. Even at present anaesthetics are available for only forty per cent of the major operations in a city like Petrograd. The imagination shrinks from contemplating the horrors implied. This policy of inhumanity is, however, at an end. Even our own State Department has now granted permission to the Joint Distribution Committee for Jewish Relief funds to send its UkrainianCommission into Soviet Russia, at their own risk, to find a way for distributing medical and food supplies. The Jewish Committee is assured "that it is the desire of the Department to facilitate the distribution of relief to innocent sufferers in Russia." It may be assumed that the Department will place no obstacles in the way of any bona fide American efforts to join in the fight against disease in Russia. It is time, for the typhus epidemic threatening Russia will not be halted by any political cordon sanitaire.

WASHINGTON dispatches, presumably inspired, announce that the government has in contemplation the lifting of the ban upon trade with Soviet Russia. Recognition is not implied. All that such action would mean is that Americans who wished to trade in Russia might try their luck. If their goods were confiscated or their agents thrown into prison, the government could take no cognizance of it. That, however, is about all the advocates of ending the blockade are asking for. It is more than the French government wishes us to grant, until the Soviet government has acknowledged the validity of French claims upon the old Russian government and its nationals. The value of those claims may be placed at between four and five billions of dollars—enough to stiffen the policy of a country less hard pressed financially than France.

GONE are the days when the apologists for British policy in Ireland could assert that the majority of Irishmen are content with British rule. "It is of no use talking about self-determination for Ireland," declares Lloyd George. Why of no use? "Because the people of Ireland, if asked, would say by an emphatic majority that they wanted their independence and an Irish republic." For America's benefit Lloyd George asserts that "De Valera is putting forward the same claim in exactly the same language as Jefferson Davis did. Acceptance of the demand

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will never be conceded. It is a demand which, if persisted in, will lead to exactly the same measures of repression as in the Southern States of America." Is that plain enough for our understanding? As to what England may be expected to do, it is plain enough. Not so as to the validity of the analogy. Before we had to coerce the South we had a real national unity, and we reestablished it. When were the Irish and English one people, and when can they be expected to become one?

EXCESS profits taxation, however obnoxious to the Republican leaders and to part of the business community, will not be repealed during the present session of Congress. The Treasury needs the revenue, and no serious project has been brought forward to replace the $1,100,000,000 the excess profits tax is expected to yield. There is talk of a one-per cent tax on retail sales, estimated by "Treasury experts" to yield as high as $1,500,000,000 per annum. Those experts ought to be investigated for arithmetical competence. A billion and a half is one per cent on one hundred and fifty billions. That is twice the total private income of all the people living in the United States. It must be four times the volume of purchasing power spent on goods at retail. And if purchases under one dollar are to be exempt the volume of taxable retail sales will come down to something under twenty-five billions. Nothing less than a five or six per cent tax on retail sales would make up for the excess profits revenues.

IT is astonishing how little attention the New York newspapers are giving to the strike of Chicago municipal employees. Food inspectors, garbage handlers and even firemen have struck or, what amounts to the same thing, have resigned en masse. And the city council has voted a $4,000,000 increase in the budget, to provide for a ten per cent increase in pay. Are there no Coolidges in Chicago, to stand up for the principle that employees of the public must abstain from using any other form of pressure than their crying needs to maintain their economic position? Are there no Nicholas Murray Butlers to denounce civil service strikers as traitors? How is it that General Wood is doing nothing and saying nothing about it? Perhaps we are no longer quite so hysterical about the labor menace as we were a few months ago.

THERE is one provision of our federal law that is so abominable that nobody, whether Republican, Democrat or Socialist, whether reactionary or liberal or radical, could defend it if it were brought to trial on its merits. That is the provision making the nationality of the wife turn upon the nationality of the husband. Just now the American soldiers returning from Vladivostok are bringing with them great numbers of brides. We ought to welcome them and wish them happiness, accepting the judgment of the men who have chosen them as to their personal quality. Some of them, no doubt, are rabid Tsarists, some, Bolshevists through and through, but what of that? It is a purely domestic matter within the new cosmopolitan households. What isn't a purely domestic matter is that these young women have become American citizens, entitled to all the privileges of citizenship without submitting to any of the tests we should feel bound to apply to their brothers, even if the brothers had married American girls. Can one conceive of a greater anomaly, in these days when only the vote of one state stands between the women of America and full political equality?

THE anomaly looks greater, however, when one reverses the case. Suppose that an American woman, having married a Russian, acquires a sentimental attachment to the principles of Lenin.—Amor vincit omnia. Straightway she becomes subject to the mercies of the departments of Justice and Labor, who may, if they choose, banish her forever from the land of her fathers. If the assumption prejudices the argument, let us try another. Suppose that an American woman, possessed of a comfortable sum of one hundred per cent American money, had married a German, Graf or Baron or commoner, before the war when many perfectly good Americans regarded such marriages as not only innocent but laudable. Where would her property be now? In the hands of the Alien Property Custodian. According to Mr. Garvan, there are 47,000 cases of that kind. What is to become of that property? If we had signed the Treaty of Versailles, we should have had the right to apply the proceeds of it, first, to settling property claims of Americans against the German government or German nationals, second, to the settlement of claims against the Austro-Hungarian, Bulgarian, Turkish governments or nationals, third, to the payment of damage claims against Germany for destruction of American ships and goods. And if anything was left of such property, it was to be credited to Germany on the reparation account. As we have not signed the Treaty, those American women have a chance of getting back what is theirs by just as good natural right as any other American's property is his. But if they do, it will be by the grace and charity of the government, not by recognition of their participation in our common American heritage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN his researches into the habitat of the Poor Fish, Art Young ought not to overlook the New York State Association of Legal Instructors. One of the members of this association has introduced a resolution denouncing Socialists admitted to the bar as "doubly dangerous" because they are "learned in the law." It was impossible, said another member, to rid socialistic students "of the virus with which they had been inoculated." A third averred that nothing that happened in law school to a certain bright and attractive young man "had any effect in checking his egotism when it came to his views on socialism." The professor's own egotism as a socialistic student had, however, been checked: "study of the law had made him a reactionary." To those who proposed to educate the Socialists out of their folly the introducer of the resolution said the danger was all the other way: the Socialists would bore from within. Once a Socialist, always a Socialist, but a Poor Fish has not a secure leg to stand on.

HOOVER'S defence of his title to a place in the Republican party must appear adequate to everybody except, perhaps, working members of the Republican party machine. It will seem rather more than adequate in the eyes of those who are members of other parties, or not party members at all, but who wish to support Hoover as a man too big to be completely clothed in any party label. In the interest of Republican party "team work" Hoover trusts "that the men and women who do me the great honor to advocate my name will bear in mind that personal criticism of the other names before the party is chiefly of service to the opposition. All these men are patriotic, honorable Americans." So they are; so also are the men whose names are before the Democratic party. Does Mr. Hoover imply that any Republican on the list is to be preferred to every Democrat? In that case he differs radically from the mass of the independent voters without whose support the Hoover boom would be a puff of wind in the desert.

HIRAM JOHNSON'S prospects are visibly improving. His strength in the Michigan primaries may be partly explained away by the fact that local conditions gave an undue prominence to the issue of campaign contributions. But his overwhelming strength in the city precincts where the labor vote predominates is bound to exert a favorable influence elsewhere. Anyway, there can hardly be a doubt that the Johnson boom is gaining throughout the country. Political experts have been testifying for some weeks to the existence of a progressive ground swell, coming from the west. It is not yet perceptible, they say, on the Atlantic seaboard, but it is bound to make itself felt before the time of the nominating conventions. They may be right. If they are, it will be necessary to revise upward all calculations of Johnson's chances. It will also be necessary to revise all Hoover calculations upward. Hoover developed modest strength, to be sure, in the Michigan Republican primaries, but that was to be anticipated. His boom is too new. His strength in the Democratic primaries indicates a promising possibility of supplementing the progressive by the independent vote—a consideration that would bear more directly upon his chances for the nomination if the Republicans were not so cocksure that they can win with any candidate. As for the general results of the Democratic primaries in Michigan, their only clear result is that the Palmer boom is a bubble. The Democrats are not yet ready to show their hand, if they have one.

## Hoover's Chances

IN two statements Mr. Hoover has begun to define his party position by the process of elimination. He will accept only a Republican nomination. He proposes to be nominated if at all, by the votes of uninstructed delegates and by the votes of delegates pledged to candidates who cannot win. He will accept such a nomination only on certain conditions, namely that the Republican party declares for:

(1) A forward looking, liberal, constructive platform on the Treaty.
(2) Ditto on our economic issues.
(3) Sound business administration of the country.
(4) Is neither reactionary nor radical on domestic questions.
(5) Is backed by men who undoubtedly assure the consummation of these policies and measures.

Mr. Hoover alone can say whether these five conditions have any reality, for they will mean just exactly as much as he chooses to make them mean. No one can interpret them for him. If it should turn out next June that Mr. Hoover is the second choice of delegates deadlocked over the first choice, if then the nomination should be offered to him, he will have to face one of those awful tests when the strength of a man's conviction are weighed against his ambitions. For Mr. Hoover has laid down conditions which would be empty rhetoric spoken by a shallow man, which may be stern realities spoken by the kind of man Mr. Hoover is.

But the road to be travelled before these con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ditions can begin to operate is long. The chances of his nomination start with an open defiance of the very men who will sit in the Republican convention. He does not "belong to their class." He is not one of them, does not wish to be regarded as one of them, has no desire to appear as one of them. On what ground are they then likely to nominate him? On this: that Wood, Lowden, Johnson, Harding having failed to secure a majority, a split convention will listen to the popular clamor and prefer Hoover to dark horses like Allen or Lenroot. Mr. Hoover has not the time or the disposition to seek delegates himself for the most excellent reasons. He cannot and will not go through the mill of the primaries. If he is to be chosen it will be because the politicians inside the convention are in such a deadlock that they feel they must listen to voices outside the convention. The hope of Hoover's candidacy rests, therefore, on the surrender of the politicians to external pressure. Admittedly they do not want Hoover; on the record Mr. Hoover does not think very highly of most of them. The premise of the Hoover candidacy is the defeat of the Republican machines in a year when these machines feel that their victory is certain.

The external pressures which might produce this political miracle are of two sorts. Those business interests which have ultimate influence with the politicians may decide that Mr. Hoover is the man best fitted to lead the readjustments of the next few years; they may concentrate on Hoover after Wood and Lowden are eliminated. If they do they will exhibit an unusual amount of foresight. Or the pressure may come out of the mass of the voters, from the newly enfranchised women and from a coalition of independents. There is no question but that Mr. Hoover can at present attract a larger quota of unattached votes than any other man in public life. They would vote Republican if he were nominated. They will scatter if he is not nominated. They will count with the politicians under present conditions only if they are needed for a Republican victory. There is not the slightest reason for believing that the politicians think they are needed.

There is only one other conceivable way in which they can count, and that is if they should come to embody the progressive crusading disposition that is always latent in America. There are unmistakable signs of a desire to make Mr. Hoover the vehicle of that same idealism which ennobled the war and was thwarted in the peace. The dominant temper of politics at this moment is a product of the fatigue of the war, the frustration at Versailles, and the panic of inexperience. It will pass. It would pass quickly, perhaps before the next election, if people could find a leadership that they could trust. The vast disinterested call for Hoover by men and women who were willing to waive differences of opinion, of party, and of personal preference, arose out of nothing but the conviction that to unite on Hoover was to restore sanity to American politics, and to prepare an administration led by hope rather than one dictated by fear. It presupposed that elusive thing, an era of good feeling, in which a conservative program was administered in a decent and liberal spirit, an era of stabilization in which men shed their fears and recovered before they set out again.

Only a powerful spiritual impulse could bring this desire to fruition. Lust of power, jingoism, greed and intolerance are eternally vigilant and aggressive, and no tepid hope will neutralize them. If Mr. Hoover's supporters are to make their support count within the walls of the Republican convention, they will have to call upon an idealism which they have not yet begun to tap. They have a candidate who can approximate closely what they mean. But they have not a political leader who can express it for nor evoke it in others. The force, if it is to exist, must come from those who want what Hoover could do. If it does not come from them, if they are not themselves incandescent, the only way that Mr. Hoover can conceivably be nominated is on conditions which would violate the very intention of the terms he has just laid down.

In promoting his candidacy there is one bit of practical politics which all of us who favor Hoover ought to keep in mind. It is that his candidacy shall not be used by experienced professionals to neutralize the progressive forces at the convention. It happens, for example, that Mr. Hoover finds himself aligned against Hiram Johnson in California. That is an accident of residence, fundamentally, and only incidentally a result of the Treaty dispute. The underlying differences between Hoover and Johnson in their general attitude towards foreign affairs are definitely less than the appearances would indicate. The differences are mainly of information and recent experience, and are far easier to remove than the differences which must forever separate men like Hoover and Johnson from men like Wood. The opposition of Johnson to this Covenant is, for example, far more conducive to world peace, than the kind of support given to the Covenant by General Wood. Mr. Hoover must know this. He must know that what matters for the next few years is not lip-service to a document, but the prejudice and vision which govern the man.

Mr. Hoover cannot afford to destroy the influence of men like Senator Johnson. He cannot af-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ford to disperse progressive strength at this juncture and it would have been better for him not to enter the California primaries, and to have stood there as he stands in the rest of the nation. If he must contest California, he will do well to remind his supporters that they are dealing with a veteran who as governor, progressive leader and United States Senator has earned the respect and appreciation of American progressives. No man can destroy Hiram Johnson's position, and call it a good day's work.

## Money to Nominate

AN election among one hundred million people and in a village community are two quite different things. Size, distance and numbers in themselves produce complications. Where the candidate is the choice of his own neighbors who have known him all his life, election is one thing; where he is the choice of people who do not know him and must be told about him, there is interposed between the voter and his final judgment the whole mechanism of modern publicity. The final vote is not the result of direct acquaintance; it is the result of the news reports, the advertising, the oratory, the elusive rumor which are the modern substitute for direct acquaintance. The choice of the voter is not among men whom he knows but among artificial pictures of men whom he does not know.

The making and selling of these pictures is the really costly part of modern campaigning. A candidate cannot personally talk to all the voters. He must reach them through other media. The other media are men, news, advertising, and propaganda. That means overhead organization, and paid local workers reaching into all the recesses where voters live. It means printing bills, postage, billboards, money to newspapers for advertising, paid workers, paid orators, offices, typewriters, telephones and telegraphs, pullmans, taxicabs, hotels, tips, motor cars, halls, buttons, flags. It means more than that. In the rotten boroughs, that is, in the states where the party has delegates but no voters, it means assistance to the coveted delegates, not necessarily bribery, but assistance. The whole thing is a costly business: fifty thousand dollars, the Wood people say, to secure five delegates in South Dakota, an expenditure of over five million dollars for a majority in the Republican convention. Grant that the same rate will not be general, divide the total amount by two or three or four and you still have a very large sum of money required merely to nominate one candidate.

The important part, however, is not the amount but the source of this money. It is clearly quite a different matter whether a million voters give a dollar apiece to nominate their candidate or if ten men give one hundred thousand dollars apiece. A million contributors would mean a genuine popular demand; ten contributors are ten men trying to sell their candidate to apathetic voters. The one is democratic, the other privileged. The remedy is absolute publicity at frequent intervals in the course of the campaign. As Senator Borah said to Senator Moses, it may be necessary to spend money for publicity but it is no less necessary to have publicity about the money spent. To light a blaze of publicity for your candidate with funds that you will not make public is wholly dangerous. He who will not publish has something to conceal. There is no escaping that. The contributors may be admirable gentlemen; the expenditures may be entirely legal. If the candidate refuses to publish he is afraid of the effect on the voters. He is afraid of democracy, and he is engaging in deceiving the democracy. No man is fit to be considered for President of the United States who in any way obstructs the people's knowledge of the means by which he is to reach that office. The people have a right to know every single fact about every relationship, public and private, which bears upon the candidate's fitness. They are choosing a supremely powerful ruler for four inevitable years.

A mechanism of publicity for campaign funds is not so difficult to conceive. Every candidate should designate a responsible financial agent, and every political party should designate one. No expenditure should be permitted without the agent's approval, and his books should at all times be open to examination. The candidate must shoulder the ultimate responsibility for his financial agent. If illegal practices have occurred through that agent's organization, the election should be void, and the candidate ineligible for office, and criminally responsible. Some evasion is, of course, possible under any system. The most important would arise in connection with unofficial, self-constituted leagues and clubs to promote the candidate. A carefully drawn law should spread a net for these, sufficiently fine to catch the big fish who matter. The auxiliary organizations, too, should be compelled to open their books, and the candidate forced during the campaign either to acknowledge responsibility for them or to repudiate them. For the essence of successful legislation against corrupting practice in elections is to center responsibility in the candidate, and make the election forfeit if he benefited by that practice. The candidate himself must be given the strongest possible reasons for helping to enforce the law. Those reasons will not exist until he suffers very much more by corrupt practice than he can gain.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The law should aim to deprive the candidate of the excuse of ignorance. The law should make it his business to know what is done in his behalf.

The candidate's responsibility for complete current publicity as to contributions and expenditures is the fundamental thing. Once that is achieved and made a regular procedure in all elections, the facts themselves will begin to speak, and remedies will suggest themselves, legal and moral, for the subtler forms of corrupt practice. Once let all the contributors, the dates of their contributions and the amount, be known, and on the other side the budget of expenses, the payrolls, the itemized purchases, the distribution of money for different kinds of activity; once let those facts become public property, a subject of public analysis and discussion, the rest will not be difficult. It is this first step which is the whole difficulty. Against it will fight every dark force in American politics.

## The Uses of the Treaty Impasse

MECHANICALLY, America remains at war with Germany. It is an odious and dangerous technicality. There is no need of dwelling on the absurdities and inconveniences of a condition that prolongs indefinitely the war powers of the Executive, that keeps alive the mass of war legislation of negative utility for peace. Nor is there need of insisting on the handicaps under which American enterprise must labor in dealing with our technical enemies, with whom the rest of the world is at peace; nor upon the baneful effect our indeterminate policy is exerting upon European political, social and economic conditions. Those who opposed and those who supported the Treaty of Versailles would join heartily in execrating the anomaly of a purely technical war.

Where opinions differ diametrically is on the question whether the technical peace we might have had if we had signed the Treaty without reservations, would be a state better or worse than that in which we now find ourselves. The New Republic shares the view of those who believe that our state would have been the worse for signing. We should have misgivings about signing the Treaty even with the most ample reservations to the Covenant, because apart from the Covenant the Treaty creates obligations upon its signatories that America could cheerfully underwrite only if there were no questions as to the justice and expediency of the Treaty. It is not the Covenant, but other clauses of the Treaty that would oblige us to share the responsibility of exacting from Germany reparation charges beyond her reasonable capacity to pay, and the odium of extending the period of occupation of the Rhinelands in case of Germany's failure to pay By still other clauses the signatory Powers are bound to regard the presence of German armed forces within fifty kilometers of the east bank of the Rhine as a hostile act. In the military, commercial and financial clauses of the Treaty there are innumerable points at which America might find herself involved in the difficulties and dangers of intervention. As against Germany, the Treaty constitutes in effect an alliance of the signatory Powers. It entangles America in a European enterprise of sadly mixed political and ethical qualities.

The Senators who oppose the Treaty with or without reservations to the Covenant may be in the wrong. But they are too numerous, and too firmly set in their convictions, to yield ground. There is not the least chance, so far as we can see, that the Treaty, without substantial reservations, can command the necessary two-thirds in the Senate until the complexion of that body may have been entirely changed as a result of the elections next fall. There is, no doubt, a chance that the President may be induced to accept the Treaty with such reservations to the Covenant as would be necessary to win a Senate majority of two-thirds. But it is a very slender chance. We have apparently reached the kind of impasse that only an appeal to the electorate can break through, and our constitutional system, unfortunately, provides no efficacious method of appealing promptly to the electorate. There is not even a guarantee that after the 4th of next March we shall have a President and Senate that can agree on the question of the Treaty of Versailles.

Is it not possible, however, to evade the whole question of the Versailles Treaty and attain peace by some such device as the Porter resolution? Let Congress pass, and the President proclaim an end to the state of war, under such conditions, to be accepted by Germany, as seem good to us. The Porter resolution confines itself to very simple conditions. The German government "waives and renounces on behalf of itself and its nationals any claim, demand, right or benefit against the United States or its nationals that it or they would not have the right to assert had the United States ratified the Treaty of Versailles." In simple English, let the German government acknowledge our title to whatever we hold in the shape of German ships, patent rights, and other private property of German nationals in our possession. We shall then be ready to place our relations with Germany on a peace footing. Presumably the sponsors for the resolution recognize that in matters of trade and intercourse the Treaty of Versailles has created a wide

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

range of privileges for the signatories that would not fall automatically to our benefit upon the proclamation of peace. As a signatory we should have acquired most-favored-nation position; as a non-signatory, we should have to resort to additional resolutions, wirelessed to Berlin for acceptance, or to direct negotiations with the Germans for a new treaty of commerce. That difficulty, however, is not insuperable.

But another difficulty is apparently quite insuperable. The peace resolution would either have to be signed by the President or passed over his veto. Would the President sign it? He would infinitely prefer to resubmit the Treaty of Versailles and accept whatever reservations the Senate might attach to it. Can the resolution be passed over the President's veto? It would have been infinitely easier to muster a two-thirds vote for ratification with reservations. There is no way here out of the impasse. We will not be so rash as to assert that no other way can be found, but we can not imagine where it lies.

The President pointed out long ago the only practicable alternatives: either the Treaty of Versailles, or a separate peace with Germany. The Porter resolution aims to realize the latter alternative in the most cumbersome possible way, in the way most offensive to the Powers signatory to the Treaty of Versailles. It can not succeed. Neither is it possible that peace may be attained through the conventional method of direct negotiation between America and her late enemy. The initiative in such negotiations would have to be taken by the President. Further observations on this point are superfluous.

By defect of our political machinery we are bound to inaction, apparently, for the next eleven months at least. A pessimistic conclusion, it may be said. But is it? All that we could get by action now is the Treaty of Versailles. But that treaty is already so thoroughly discredited that only France among the Principal Allied and Associated Powers now desires to enforce its provisions. England, Italy and Japan would be glad to find a way to the revision of the Treaty. Before eleven months have elapsed it may well be that France also will see her advantage and the advantage of the world in a revision that will pave the way for a rational reconstitution of European relationships. The inaction of the United States keeps the question open. And if the nations that have signed the Treaty refuse to revise it, the way remains open to America to make her own peace, safeguarding her own interests under the armistice, which must continue to govern our relations with the enemy states until peace is formally concluded. There may yet be a Treaty of Washington to supplement the Treaty of Versailles. The other Allied and Associated Powers would have a right to be heard in the negotiations and a voice in matters pertaining to their interests. Even though they were given equal voting power, such as we enjoyed at Versailles, a Treaty of Washington would be animated by a very different spirit from that of Versailles. It might well serve as a basis for a real League of Nations, to supplant the Alliance of Conquerors constituted under the name of the League by the Big Four at Versailles.

## Up to the Voters

IN order to carry through its protest against the unseating of the Socialist Assemblymen in the New York Legislature the World announces its intention of supporting those Assemblymen for re-election next November. This is an unprecedented course for a non-Socialist newspaper to follow, but it is logical and right. Considering the reasons which Speaker Sweet's opponents, including the World, have urged against the unseating, they are bound to carry their quarrel with the Republican majority at Albany to the polls. The use of their votes against its perpetrators is the only effective method which non-Socialist democrats can employ to express their uncompromising disapproval of the consummation of this act of legalized but none the less revolutionary violence. The New York Assembly has denied to a large group of American citizens the exercise of the right of political representation because it does not agree with their political and economic opinions. In so far as its action prevails, the state of New York has ceased to be a democracy. Its government is no longer grounded on the free competition of alternative policies in the market of the voters' conscience. Messrs. Sweet and Lusk have transformed it into a closed shop which excludes Socialists as heretics from any effective participation in the political life of the community and condemns them to a choice between revolution or impotence.

The advocates of the expulsion of the Socialist Assemblymen have represented their act as one additional and necessary strategic move in a patriotic campaign against revolutionary violence. Some months ago public opinion might have had some excuse for accepting this interpretation of the Lusk Committee's work, but by taking this particular step Messrs. Sweet and Lusk have given themselves away. They have betrayed the underlying purpose and the ultimate object of their campaign. They are not really afraid of revolutionary violence. The result, if not the object, of their proceedings will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be to provoke it. The American people are united as are no other people in the world in favor of constitutional government. Any act of revolutionary violence or any utterances which directly instigated such an act would arouse an overwhelming flood of popular condemnation and disgust. The heresy-hunters in New York and Albany are trying to take advantage of this American patriotic loyalty and American hatred of treasonable violence for the purpose of suppressing the expression and the fermentation of radical thought. It is radical ideas which they fear rather than revolutionary action. They are so little afraid of violence and are so ready to use it themselves that they are in effect instigating it in order to obtain a better chance of suppressing it. What they are really afraid of is revealed by the rest of their legislative program. The same people who instigated the expulsion of the Socialist Assemblymen are now proposing to interfere with the teaching of economic radicalism. The bills of the Lusk Committee, which, for the first time in an American commonwealth, lay violent hands on freedom of teaching, round out the policy of terrorizing opinion which they began with the raids, which they continued by an inquisition into heretical ideas, and which they will consummate, if possible, by the disfranchisement of Socialist voters and by the proscription of those schools, which do not teach orthodox economic and social doctrine. The Lusk Committee will then have done all that it can to discourage the peaceful dissemination of radical or heretical convictions and to provoke to the use of violence those who are trying to persuade their fellow citizens to understand why radical social changes are necessary or desireable.

Neither is it an accident that the Republican majority which is doing the bidding of Speaker Sweet and Senator Lusk is one of the most arbitrary, slavish and unscrupulous political rings which has ever controlled the legislature of an American state. The same ardent patriots who are unseating Socialist representatives, authorizing inquisitions into opinions, outlawing freedom of teaching and proscribing the Socialist party are also saving the nation by refusing to allow the welfare bills for women even the opportunity of discussion on the floor of the Assembly. They act on the bidding of lobbyists and politicians who call the friends of these welfare bills pro-German and un-American. They refuse even to consider any program of administrative reform in the state government and they sedulously practice the complete subordination of public to party allegiance which they propose to forbid in the case of the Socialists.

The defeat of this conspiracy to undermine the foundations of the American democracy is the most important immediate job of the liberal non-Socialist voters in New York state. Whether or not the conspiracy succeeds depends chiefly on these voters. If the disfranchised Socialists are left to fight alone against the legalized violence at Albany, one of two things will happen. Either the conspiracy will succeed and the conspirators will force the Socialists into the advocacy of violence or the conspiracy will fail and the Socialists will become, as they did in Germany, after Bismarck's attempt to suppress them by law, the chief representatives of democracy in New York state. Liberals cannot afford to allow the Socialists either to abandon democratic political methods or to obtain exclusive possession of democratic principles. For if the Socialists are allowed either to monopolize or to repudiate democracy, their subsequent temper and behavior would render it as difficult for a wholesome liberalism to flourish in New York as it was for a wholesome liberalism to flourish in Germany before the war. The Lusk Committee and the majority at Albany are not working any damage to Socialism. Socialism always thrives as the result of persecution; and persecution is exactly what American Socialism needs in order to thrive. It is liberalism and progressivism which the policy of the Lusk Committee and its political accomplices tends to emasculate. For liberalism consists fundamentally in the application of the best available knowledge and thought to the work of political and economic improvement. But Messrs. Lusk and Sweet distrust thought and ideas. They are trying to create an atmosphere of persecution and terror which will render impossible the search for political and social truth radically different from the truth which is implicit in the established institutions of society.

Liberal and progressive voters have, consequently, even a stronger reason than Socialist voters for carrying this issue to the polls. The kind of politicians who are Prussianizing the American democracy at Albany do not respect anything except power and do not listen to protests which are not sustained by votes. They will not cease their work of obstruction, inquisition, persecution and reaction until they discover that they have not, as they supposed, started off for a joy ride on the royal road to popularity. But in order to awaken them to this discovery progressive voters who propose to carry their quarrel with the Albany ring to the polls should not confine themselves, as the World suggests, to favoring the re-election of the unseated Socialist Assemblymen. The great majority of progressive electors will not have any opportunity of voting for the Socialist Assemblymen and in any event the Republican majority at Albany may succeed in barring the Socialist candidates

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the ballot. The best way for them to enter a penetrating protest is to refuse to vote for any nominee for Assemblyman and State Senator who approves of the unseating of the Socialists or of the bills of the Lusk Committee. Neither should their discrimination stop at that point. If, for instance, a man like Governor Smith, who has opposed the unseating of the Socialist Assemblymen solicits their support for governor or the Senate of the United States against a Republican who supports the policy of his party machine, a progressive voter would do well to prefer Governor Smith. A temporary combination between Socialist and liberal voters could make it difficult, if not impossible, for any ally of Speaker Sweet and Senator Lusk to be elected to any important office within the gift of the voters of New York City or any other large city in the state. It is up to them to use this power decisively at the next election and so to kill the conspiracy against the democratic ideal while it is yet young. There is no chance of reputable government, much less progressive legislation, as long as the Legislature takes orders from Messrs. Sweet and Lusk. There is every reason to believe that if they remain in power they will not change their spots. They will carry further on their present policy of choking the flow of liberalism at its source by proscribing freedom of political discussion, by impairing freedom of teaching, and by trying to stigmatize as dangerous to the state any radical unorthodoxy of opinion. A citizen who values the traditional political ideals of the American democracy and the reputation of New York as a democratic commonwealth will vote next November chiefly for those candidates to state offices whose election will tend to destroy the power and discredit the leadership of the Sweet ring at Albany.

## The Coal Award

COMPROMISE and conciliation characterize the award of the majority report of the Coal Commission. There is a spirit of conciliation, but not much of a disposition to compromise in the minority report submitted by John P. White, representing the miners. The majority report stands, however, since both parties had agreed in advance to accept the findings of the Commission, without reservation on ground of unanimity. The fundamental working conditions of the industry will be determined by it for the period from April 1, 1920. How fair is it?

The majority report awards an increase in wages amounting to about 27 per cent, in lieu of the 14 per cent increase granted last fall by the Fuel Administrator. That means that tonnage workers' wages will represent an average of 88 per cent over 1913, and day men an increase of 111 per cent. The demand for a six hour day and a five day week is rejected, the majority believing that considerations of national economy require an eight hour day at the face of the coal. These are the essential points of the award, although there are minor points relating to housing, charges for powder, etc., which are the subject of recommendations for the most part fair and candid. The Commission recognizes that no mere wage award can bring peace and prosperity to an industry so gravely afflicted with irregularity of employment as bituminous coal mining, and offers a long series of recommendations for relieving the industry of its seasonal character. It urges the railways and public service corporations to lay up stocks of coal in the slack months and suggests that the Interstate Commerce Commission should reduce coal rates in those months in order to encourage the general public to stock up. The federal reserve banks, the report intimates, might be induced to extend credit for the purpose. There are dangers and technical difficulties in the carrying of bituminous coal stocks, but these, it would appear, are not insuperable. The report makes it sufficiently clear that by some such cooperative effort the nation's coal supply could be produced by a smaller number of mines operated with a fair degree of regularity and affording steady employment to a smaller number of men than are now working in the industry. Thus the problem of a living wage for the men actually employed could be put in the way of solution without any very extreme advance in the price of coal. But, of course, these measures have not been put into effect yet, and there is no machinery proposed for putting them into effect. We are therefore bound to consider how far the wages award is adequate for decent living under the conditions that actually obtain.

The majority report accepts the principle that wages ought to be sufficient for family maintenance at the American standard of living. Does the award actually fix wages at such a level? One searches the majority report for proof of this, but in vain. Instead, what seems chiefly to have weighed with the majority commissioners was the advance in the cost of living. Costs of living had risen above pre-war levels by 83 per cent in October, 1919, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. They have since risen considerably. In the same period wages had increased by 43 per cent for tonnage workers and 76 per cent for day men. The present award appears to cover the discrepancy, with a little over for good measure. That might be fair if wages in 1913 had corresponded with the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ideal of an American standard of living. Did they? That is a point on which the majority report throws no light. We turn to the minority report, to find evidence which would be hard to challenge that bituminous wages in 1913 were very much indeed below a decent American standard. The award, then, appears merely to crystallize, for another two years, the extremely unsatisfactory wages situation of the pre-war period. The advance in money wages leaves the miner where he was, with respect to purchasing power. Of course prices may come down in the next two years, and this might improve the miner's position. But as the majority report remarks, that would merely be compensation for the past months in which wages did not keep pace with living costs. Also, prices may go higher, or if they fall, their fall may be accompanied by depression which will take from the miners through unemployment more than it gives them in cheaper goods.

According to the minority report, yearly earnings under the award will average between twelve and thirteen hundred, with sixteen or seventeen hundred as a maximum. The lowest recent calculations of the cost of living for an average family of five persons are those of the National Industrial Conference Board. They put $1,385 as the minimum and $1,658 as a "more liberal" standard, for Lawrence, Mass. The latter standard appears meagre enough, if you examine its details. A calculation of the mine worker's family budget drawn up by the miners' representatives according to Professor Ogburn's formula, gives a total of $2,103; drawn up according to the formula of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, it would total about the same. If we arbitrarily reduce the totals by $300, we still have $1,800 as a minimum for an American standard of living for the miners. We can see no possibility of their getting it, under the award.

As to the decision on the matter of hours, it is difficult to accept the reasoning of either the majority or the minority report. The minority report argues for a thirty hour week, on the assumption that thereby continuous employment throughout the year might be secured. We can see no reason why, in default of a better organization of the market and transportation, the old evil of irregular employment would not again creep in under the six hour day. There would still be rush seasons, drawing more men into the industry than could be employed continuously. The cogent argument for a shorter working day turns either on considerations of justice or on considerations of efficiency. Are eight hours at the face of the coal a longer day than can properly be required of an American workingman? Do eight hours run beyond the day of maximum efficiency? The majority report answers these questions in the negative, but without convincing argument. The miner who works eight hours at the face of the coal spends usually half an hour, sometimes an hour, in going from the mouth of the mine to the coal. He is underground nine or ten hours, exposed to underground risks and deprivations. A reduction of actual work to seven hours would hardly place him even on a parity, as to personal sacrifice, with the workers in shops or factories above ground. He is as likely to be overwearied, with consequent loss of efficiency.

The award does not place coal mining on what will be felt by the miners to be a satisfactory basis. Still, it adds approximately $96,000,000 to the advance of rather more than $100,000,000 allowed under the Fuel Administrator's decision. Who will pay that sum, the operators or the consumer? The Commission finds that the operators shifted to the consumer about 80 per cent of Dr. Garfield's advance. The majority report expresses the hope that competition will force the operators to assume a considerable part of the additional charge now laid upon the industry. The better mines could afford to do this, the weaker ones could not, but there is no good reason for continuing the weaker ones in operation, especially if a proper organization of deliveries can keep the better mines operating continuously.

There is adequate provision made for the adjustment of disputes under the award, and evidence of a disposition to work for industrial harmony through the recognized unions. This spirit of industrial tolerance may perhaps make acceptable to the miners a settlement which, so far as its material items are concerned, must bitterly disappoint them.

The New
REPUBLIC
*A Journal of Opinion*

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1920, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY — CHARLES MERZ
FRANCIS HACKETT — WALTER LIPPMANN
ALVIN JOHNSON — PHILIP LITTELL
SIGNE TOKSVIG, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Logic of Lowden

THERE is a logic to Lowden, once you grant the premises. He comes from the middle of the country, he stands in the middle of a road, in the middle of his party, about midway between Wood of New Hampshire and Johnson of California. He has risen from a farm to an estate, from obscurity to moderate fame, perhaps not quite the darling of the gods but surely one of their favorite sons. They rejoiced over him at the start, worried over him a while and watched him solicitously, and now smile again. He entered politics when Cannon and Lorimer were powerful. He was of the Old Guard at Chicago in 1912, and yet not of them altogether. He voted for Taft without making an enemy of Roosevelt. He stayed with the party and he will always stay with the party. He does not secede himself, but he does not excommunicate those who do. So Roosevelt could write to him in 1916: "I earnestly hope you will now assume a position of leadership. What I most desire is that you shall help bring the Republicans far enough forward to enable us to hold the Progressives far enough back to keep a substantial alignment." He is thus the candidate of peace without victory for those who stood at Armageddon and battled for the Lord.

It is a series of events in the past that emphasize the candidacy of Lowden today. His most intelligent supporters regard him as a kind of liquidator of situations which happen to control American public life today and may continue to control them for a short time after the election. The first of these is the grim memory of the politicians that Johnson seceded in 1912, and ratified only with nullifying reservations in 1916. The second is the eight years of Republican famine under Wilson plus the recollection of the seven years turbulence under Roosevelt which have combined to create a nausea at strong men, moral heroes, crusaders, saviors, and supermen. The third is the condition of the voters, more composed than they were a few months ago, but still jumpy and yawning for a rest. The people are tired, tired of noise, tired of politics, tired of inconvenience, tired of greatness, and longing for a place where the world is quiet and where all trouble seems dead leaves and spent waves riot in doubtful dreams of dreams.

Lowden is the noiseless candidate in this campaign. I have watched him appeal to the voters. He tells them that he will talk only of prosaic things, and he does. He assures them that he won't bother them much and he will not. He promises to relieve their taxes, to see that the government is unobtrusive, and that it will run itself without too much cost and without too much friction. He does not invite them to look to Washington for salvation, or to stake much hope upon politics. He invites them to go about their own business with the sense that though the government is a necessary institution which ought to be run inexpensively and well, it is not the chief instrument of destiny. His own campaign literature names in the first of five reasons why he is "outstanding Presidential timber" the fact that "many have called him a second McKinley."

There is nothing highfalutin' about Lowden. He is not burning with moral zeal or with personal ambition. He has a diminished conception of the office which he seeks, and if he represents any "movement" it is the movement away from overshadowing personalities in the White House. Wood and Johnson arouse fierce passions, inquisitor and crusader, hot blue blood, and hot red blood. They are the turbulent spirits of the Republican campaign: Johnson the expansive, pioneering courage of continental America, Wood the angry ambitions of a receding caste in the first crude manifestation of world power. Both represent an idealization of the American purpose and, therefore, at this moment a somewhat highly flavored version of it. But Lowden is unmistakably the typical member of a going concern, the experienced guardian and manipulator of established American custom in the relation between business and politics. That is the logic of Lowden. His premise is the American social system, modified from time to time by the reformer, but never captured by him. In that system the progressive is free to permeate if he is content also to be permeated. ". . . . . help bring the Republicans far enough forward to enable us to hold the Progressives far enough back" for what purpose? "To keep a substantial alignment."

The philosophy of a substantial alignment is the premise of Lowdenism. Historically it is a real premise, no matter how unreal it may prove to be in the years to come. The philosophy when it is articulate, says that in a country so vast as this the differences between sections and between classes are so numerous that organized government would be unworkable if all local interests and all class interests were clearly represented in political action; that without the selecting and neutralizing and binding peace of the two party system the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American constitution would be infinitely confused. The philosophy asserts that without the coercion of a national partisanship over all factional differences national unity could not have been created and national administration organized. This philosophy accords usefulness to the political machine for which the ordinary reformer does not make allowance. That function is the fusing of localism by the attachment of local leaders to a national organization in which they have a vested interest. The power of that machine is the power to enforce conformity by blockading political advancement of those who do not work with it and through it. In its higher reaches this philosophy insists that no particular reform achieved by a destruction of the machine is valuable enough to warrant the destruction; that to capture the machine from within is legitimate, to secede and break it and try to supplant it is dangerous and in the end vain.

Now among the convinced machinists there are, of course, immovable and corrupt men mixed with shrewd and generous men. The usual opposition of temperaments and interests occurs within a political machine as within any other human group. There is a right, a center, and a left wing, and all gradations between. There are the usual bourbons who will never learn, and finally destroy the institution if they govern it. There are those who work from within to readjust it to new necessities. And there are those in the center who, recognizing the need of fresh adjustments, devote themselves to hauling the bourbons along while they hang on to the coat tails of the reformers. Lowden belongs to this center, to the right center in all great questions of statesmanship, to the left center in questions of routine and partisanship. The center, mind you, is the center of the Republican party conceived as one of the two indispensable organs of government. I am not discussing whether that party as a whole is too far to the right to govern America successfully after a world war. I am not discussing it here because the consciousness that there is such a question is not part of the premise on which the Lowden campaign proceeds.

The Lowden campaign is not based on any diagnosis of the social system. The Wood campaign is. The picture, it seems to me, is frenzied and misleading, but it is a picture. There is a conscious social theory behind Wood, as there is behind Johnson and Hoover. The attention of these men is fixed upon the country; the attention of the Lowden campaign is fixed upon Congress and the departments and the mechanism of parties. It is fixed on these primarily. The impulse behind the Lowden campaign is that an election is decreed by law for this year, that a man must be elected to the office of President who will do the job well. The job is conceived as the administration of the government at Washington, not as a moral purification, not as the redemption of America from perils, not as gawdsaking in any form.

It is characteristic that while Wood is the hero of a large number of biographies, while Johnson is personally known and loved by multitudes of people, there are no biographies of Lowden and he is comparatively little discussed. He is not a household name as yet. He has not been extensively and intensely analyzed. The talk about him is not curious and eager talk. He is not a natural subject for American publicity. He rarely says witty things; and he has almost no gift of phrase. To find out about Lowden you have to inquire among people who have known him. I have found no substantial disagreement among his friends and his critics.

He was born in 1861 at Sunrise, Minnesota. As a little boy he followed his father's prairie schooner into Iowa. He taught school when he was a young man, and worked his way through Iowa State University. He seems to have been extraordinarily winning, and many stories are told of the way in which his genius for making friends presided over the opportunities which were offered to him. Frank Lowden was the sort of student whom everyone accepts as a coming man. He has been a good deal of a regular fellow in his time, and at sixty the marks are there. But the underlying texture is homespun—however much it may have been overlaid.

He came to Chicago in 1885 and worked as a law clerk; he studied law at what is now Northwestern University; his quick professional successes corresponded with quick social success. In the early nineties there were plenty of silver spoons offered in lieu of the one he had lacked at birth. He seems to have been a lawyer engaged primarily in the organization of what are loosely called "trusts." He made money. In 1896 he married into the social set to which he had been adopted. He married the daughter of George M. Pullman. I mention it because it is always mentioned in connection with Lowden, not because I can trace any specific result of the Governor's relation to the family which sacrificed its name to one of the outstanding horrors of a hurried civilization. He has been accused, of course, of a corporate bias, but that bias, such as it is, is the bias of his time and his group, and not specific to the sleeping cars. The Wood supporters in South Dakota charge that a tax commission appointed by Lowden reduced the assessed valuation of powerful public service corporations including the Pullman Company. The charge was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made by Mr. William H. Malone, the former president of the State Board of Equalization. This board was elective. It was abolished in the Lowden reorganization of state affairs. Said Mr. Malone:

> The Pullman Corporation was favored with a reduction of $17,802,284 from the 1918 figure established by the old board of $33,802,284 to the 1919 figure fixed by the Lowden Commission of $16,000,000.

The Lowden reply is as follows. It comes to me in the form of a personal letter from Mr. Frank H. Scott of the firm of Scott, Bancroft, Martin and Stephens:

> Governor Lowden does not own any stock or securities of the Pullman Company; Mrs. Lowden owns less than one per cent of the stock of the company; the entire Pullman family owns something less than six per cent, including Mrs. Lowden's interest.
>
> In the investigation referred to (i. e. by a joint committee of the Legislature) each person who had made any charge that the Governor had interested himself for the Pullman Company, was put upon the stand before the investigating committee. The charges collapsed utterly. The State Board of Equalization had for years been looked upon as one of the most iniquitous factors in the government of Illinois, and for years governors of the state had desired to see it abolished. Governor Lowden months before the charges were made, or before any question of raising the Pullman taxes had arisen, instructed Mr. Woodward to prepare the bill abolishing the Board and establishing a Tax Commission of three members. Certain members of the Board concocted a scheme to defeat the bill by raising the Pullman Company's assessment and then following that by statements that the Governor, through the State Director of Finance, had threatened to present a bill abolishing the Board if the taxes were raised. As I have said, the fact was that the bill was prepared months before the question of raising the Pullman assessment had been broached. Governor Lowden immediately demanded an investigation by a joint committee of the Legislature. That the matter was a plot was so clearly exposed that the Legislature, the majority of whose members had been opposed to the bill abolishing the Board, immediately passed it by an overwhelming majority.

Men with established fortunes who have political careers ahead of them do not behave as these charges allege. They are not credible charges, for they involve an undue simplification of the economic interpretation of politics. What determines the point of view of Lowden is not Pullman money or any strong-box full of securities. He is determined by the prevailing views of an established order of business and politics in which he has been a favored person. The determinism is by no means complete. The history of Lowden shows a steady modification of the normal views of his environment by the interests of a personal career. To put it very bluntly Lowden has all that money can buy, and he seeks now the things that money does not buy. His later career is marked by the growing independence of an independent fortune and conspicuous political success.

It was not always so. Lowden's apprenticeship in politics began with the first McKinley campaign. He was offered patronage by McKinley and declined. But his political associations from the Republican convention of 1900 through the gubernatorial contest of 1904 when he was defeated for the nomination, through three terms in Congress, through the convention of 1912 to his election as Governor in 1916 is without evidence of independence of the dark forces of American politics. Lowden went to the top through the usual channels, a rich man and a favored man accepting the standards of his time.

The change comes after his election as Governor. Lowden braced up. Lowden reformed. Lowden made himself one of the very best state governors in America. Again and again I was told in Chicago by friends and opponents that they had expected nothing and that he had done extremely well.

The thing he did was to persuade the legislature to adopt a radical reorganization of the business of the state, by consolidating about a hundred and twenty-five separate boards and departments into nine departments, with a real budget and with a centralized purchasing agency. Of course, extravagant claims have been made. I have heard Lowden orators talk as if these reforms would solve all social wrongs from the high cost of living to industrial unrest. I heard the Governor in Detroit make rather over-enthusiastic claims. And it is well to take with caution the figures as to tax reduction.

That, however, is not the significant aspect in a definition of Lowden as a Presidential candidate. The scheme is not his scheme. It is the result of expert investigation started before he was Governor. It embodies ideas that are the common property of administrative reformers. The thing which is Lowden's is primarily that he could take up an idea so unpleasant to the politicians of all parties, and yet persuade and compel them to accept it with a minimum of friction. There lies his strength. That would be his strength in Washington. He has shown extraordinary skill in dealing with our kind of representative government. He has the patience and the good fellowship and the modesty to find his way tolerably well through the existing confusion in America between legislature and executive. No other man mentioned, Wood, Hoover, Johnson, starts with much prospect of good feeling between the White House and the Capitol. Lowden has that prospect, a very heavy factor, indeed, in the logic of his candidacy.

But, of course, internal good feeling on Pennsylvania Avenue is not the whole of statecraft in this age. And when you examine Lowden's external relations the outlook is different. He has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shown in Illinois that he can in some of his appointments be quite class-blind. His dealings with labor in Illinois show tolerance and good will and consideration but little more can be said for them. On state business he is a well-informed enthusiastic man; on all the wider questions of diplomacy, and economics, even on the wider aspects of his own administrative reforms, he is meager. Because he is meager he bends to every wind of doctrine that blows in the circle of his associates.

He has had the red hysteria mildly, and because he is fundamentally uncritical and alien to the world of ideas, his oratory is full of stock prejudice and canned platitude. They are part of the going concern. But the homespun saves him. Real contact with the Prussian spirit in America is doing to Lowden what it will always do to the balanced American, to the American who is not exalté. It is resurrecting the good humor of free men. Lowden may have said and done foolish things in the recent excitement, but he did them as a member of a crowd and because he is gregarious, not because they are organic to him. And he has done some wise things recently. In the last few months when so many Americans have been frightened into violence, Lowden has been a good deal the candid friend of local big business. He has reminded Chicagoans of the familiar idea about sitting on the safety valve.

He has done it as one of them, and that too is part of the logic of Lowden. He is one of the insiders who know when they have had enough, know when to yield, know when not to stand pat. He believes, as Roosevelt said, in a substantial alignment; he is shrewd enough and sufficiently professional in politics to know when the strain and stress are too great. He will feel the pressure rather than understand it, and he will feel it concretely not as the incarnation of an ideology. He will go only a very little way with the reconstruction, but when he has reached the end the first thing that occurs to him will not be to ship or shoot. He is a clean opponent and a tolerant human being.

No volcanic ambitions dominate him. He is a normally satisfied man, without restlessness and with a capacity for contentment. He is not fiercely avid of power nor of fame, and he is under no delusion that he is the savior of America. He is a leading candidate this year because the turn of the calendar brings the campaign at a time when old situations are still controlling and newer alignments not quite formed. The logic of Lowden is excellent on the premise that the present mood of public discussion is a true reflection of what the next President must face. On no other.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

# Strawinsky

THE new steel organs of man have begotten their music in Le Sacre du Printemps. For with Strawinsky, the rhythms of machinery enter musical art. With this, his magistral work, a new chapter of music commences, the spiritualization of the new body of man is manifest. Through Debussy, music had liquefied, become opalescent and impalpable and fluent. It had become, because of his sense, his generation's sense, of the infirmity of things, a sort of symbol of the eternal flux, the eternal momentariness. It had come to body forth all that merges and changes and disappears, to mirror the incessant departures and evanescences of life, to shape itself upon the infinitely subtle play of light, the restless, heaving, foaming surface of the sea, the impalpable racks of perfume, upon gusts of wind and fading sounds, upon all the ephemeral wonders of the world. But through Strawinsky there has come to be a music stylistically wellnigh the reverse of that of the impressionists. Through him, music has become again cubical, lapidary, massive, mechanistic. Scintillation is gone out of it. The delicate sinuous melodic line, the glamorous sheeny harmonies, are gone out of it. The elegance of Debussy, the golden sensuality, the quiet, classic touch, are flown. Instead, there are come to be great weighty metallic masses, molten piles and sheets of steel and iron, shining adamantine bulks. Contours are become grim, severe, angular. Melodies are sharp, rigid, asymmetrical. Chords are uncouth, square clusters of notes, stout and solid as the pillars that support roofs, heavy as the thuds of trip hammers. Above all, there is rhythm, rhythm rectangular and sheer and emphatic, rhythm that lunges and beats and reiterates and dances with all the steely perfect tirelessness of the machine, shoots out and draws back, shoots upward and shoots down, with the inhuman motion of titanic arms of steel. Indeed, the change is as radical, as complete, as though in the midst of moonlit noble gardens a giant machine had arisen swiftly from the ground, and inundated the night with electrical glare, and set its metal thews and joints relentlessly whirring, relentlessly functioning.

And yet, the two styles, Debussy's and Strawinsky's, are related. Indeed, they are complementary. They are the reactions to the same stimulus of two fundamentally different types of mind. No doubt, between the two men there exist differences besides those of their general fashions of thinking. The temper of Debussy was profoundly sensuous and aristocratic and contained. That of Strawinsky is nervous and ironic and violent. The one man issued from an unbroken tradition,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was produced by generations and generations of gentlemen. The other is one of those beings who seem to have been called into existence solely by the modern way of life, by express trains and ocean grayhounds, by the shrinkage of continents and the vibration of the twentieth century world. But the chief difference, the difference that made Le Sacre du Printemps almost antithetical to Pelléas et Mélisande, is essentially the divergence between two cardinal manners of apprehending life. Debussy, on the one hand, seems to be of the sort of man in whom the center of conscience is, figuratively, sunken; one of those who have within themselves some immobility that makes the people and the things about them appear fleeting and unreal. For such, the world is a far distant thing, lying out on the rims of consciousness, delicate and impermanent as sunset hues or the lights and gestures of the dream. The music of Debussy is the magistral and classic picture of this distant and glamorous procession, this illusory and fantastical and transparent show, this thing that changes from moment to moment and is never twice the same, and flows away from us so quickly. But Strawinsky, on the other hand, is in the very midst of the thing so distant from the other man. For him, the material world is very real, sharp, immediate. He loves it, enjoys it, is excited by its many forms. He is vividly responsive to its traffic. Things make an immediate and biting impression on him, stimulate in him pleasure and pain. He feels their edge and knows it hard, feels their weight and knows it heavy, feels their motion in all its violence. Strawinsky takes an almost frenetic delight in the processes that go on about him. He goes through the crowded thoroughfares, through cluttered places, through factories, hotels, wharves, sits in railway trains, and the glare and tumult and pulsation, the engines and locomotives and cranes, the whole mad phantasmagoria of the modern city, evoke images in him, inflame him to reproduce them in all their weight and gianthood and mass, their blackness and luridness and power. The most vulgar things and events excite him. The traffic, the restlessness of crowds, the noise of vehicles, of the clatter of horses on the asphalt, of human cries and calls sounding above the street-bass, a couple of organ-grinders trying to outplay each other, a brass band coming down the avenue, the thunder of a railway train hurling itself over leagues of steel, the sirens of steamboats and locomotives, the roar of cities and harbors, become music to him. In one of his early orchestral sketches, he imitates the buzzing of a hive of bees. One of his miniatures for string-quartet bangs with the beat of the wooden shoes of peasants dancing to the snarling tones of a bagpipe. Another reproduces the droning of the priest in a little chapel, recreates the scene almost cruelly. And the score of Petruschka is alive marvellously with the rank, garish life of a cheap fair. Its bubbling flutes, seething instrumental caldron, concertina-rhythms and bright gaudy colors conjure up the movement of the crowds that surge about the amusement booths, paint to the life the little flying flags, the gestures of the showmen, the bright balloons, the shooting-galleries, the gipsy tents, the crudely stained canvas walls, the groups of coachmen and servant girls and children in their holiday finery. One can even smell the frying sausages.

For Strawinsky is one of those composers, found scattered all along the pathway of his art, who augment the expressiveness of music through direct imitation of nature. His imagination seems to be free, bound in no wise by what other men have adjudged music to be, and by what their practice has made it. He comes to his art without prejudice or preconception of any kind, it seems. He plays with its elements as capriciously as the child plays with paper and crayons. He amuses himself with each instrument of the band, careless of its customary uses. There are times when Strawinsky comes into the solemn conclave of musicians like a gamin with trumpet and drum. He disports himself with the infinitely dignified string-quartet, makes it do light and acrobatic things. There is one interlude of Petruschka that is written for snare-drums alone. His work is incrustated with cheap waltzes and barrel-organ tunes. He makes the orchestra imitate the quavering of an old hurdy-gurdy. Of late, he has written a ballet for eight clowns. And he is reported to have said, "I should like to bring it about that music be performed in street cars, while people get out and get in." For he finds his greatest enemy in the concert room, that rut that limits the play of the imagination of audiences, that fortress in which all of the intentions of the men of the past have established themselves, and from which they dominate the musical present. The concert room has succeeded in making music a drug, a sedative, has created a "musical attitude" in folk that is false, and robbed musical art of its power. For Strawinsky, music is either an infection, the communication of a lyrical impulse, or nothing at all. And so he would have it performed in ordinary places of congregation, at fairs, in taverns, music halls, street cars, if you will, in order to enable it to function freely once again. His art is pointed to quicken, to infect, to begin an action that the listener must complete within himself. It is a sort of musical shorthand. On paper, it has a fragmentary look. It is as though

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Strawinsky had sought to reduce the elements of music to their sharpest and simplest terms, had hoped that the "development" would be made by the audience. He seems to feel that if he cannot achieve his end, the communication of his lyrical impulse, with a single strong motif, a single strong movement of tones, a single rhythmic start, he cannot achieve it at all. So we find him writing songs, the three Japanese lyrics, for instance, that are epigrammatic in their brevity; a piece for string quartet that is played in fifty seconds; a three-act opera performed in thirty minutes.

But it is no experiment in form that he is making. He seems to bring into music some of the power of the Chinese artists who, in the painting of a twig, or of a pair of blossoms, represent the entire springtide. He has written some of the freshest, most rippling, delicate music. Scarcely a living man has written more freshly or incandescently. April, the flowering branches, the snowing petals, the clouds high in the blue, are really in the shrilling little orchestra of the Japanese lyrics, in the green gurgling flutes and watery violins. None of the innumerable Spring Symphonies, Spring Overtures, Spring Songs, are really more vernal, more soaked in the gentle sunshine of spring, are more really the seed-time, than the six naive piping measures of melody that introduce the figure of the Sacre entitled Rondes Printanières. Is any slumber-song really fuller of sleep than the few pages of L'Oiseau de Feu that precede the death of Kastchei the Immortal? No doubt, in venturing to write music so bold and original in aesthetic, Strawinsky was encouraged by the example of another musician, another Russian composer. Moussorgsky, before him, had trusted in his own innocence instead of in the wisdom of the fathers of the musical church, had dared obey the promptings of his own blood and set down chords, melodies, rhythms, just as they sang in his skull, though all the world rise up to damn him. But the penning of music as jagged, cubical, barbarous as the prelude to the third act of Strawinsky's little opera The Nightingale, or as naked, uncouth, rectangular, rocklike, polyharmonic, headlong, as some of that of Le Sacre du Printemps required no less perfect a conviction, no less great a self-reliance. The music of Strawinsky is the expression of an innocence comparable, indeed, to that of his great predecessor. Le Sacre du Printemps is what its composer termed it. It is "an act of faith."

And so, free of preconceptions, Strawinsky was able to let nature move him to imitation. Just as Picasso brings twentieth century nature into his still lives, so the young composer brings it into his music. It is the rhythm of machinery that has set Strawinsky, the artist, free. All his life, he has been conscious of these steel men. Mechanical things have influenced his art from the beginning. It is as though machinery had revealed him to himself, as though sight of the functioning of these metal organisms, themselves but the extension of human bones and muscles and organs, had awakened into play the engine that is his proper body, as though the infection of the dancing, lunging, pumping piston-rods, walking beams, drills, has awakened out of him a response, and given him his power to beat out rhythm. The machine has always fascinated him. One of his first original compositions, written while he was yet a pupil of Rimsky-Korsakof's, imitates fireworks, distinguishes what is human in their activity, in the popping, hissing, exploding, in the hysterical weeping of the fiery fountains, the proud exhibitions and sudden collapses of the pin-wheels. It is the machine, enemy of man, that is pictured by The Nightingale, that curious work of which one act dates from 1909, and two from 1914. Strawinsky had the libretto formed on the tale of Hans Christian Andersen which recounts the adventures of the little brown bird which sings so beautifully that the Emperor of China bids it to his court. Strawinsky's nightingale, too, comes to the palace and sings, and all the ladies of the entourage fill their mouths with water in the hopes of better imitating the warbling of the songster. But then there enter envoys bearing the gift of the Emperor of Japan, a mechanical nightingale that amuses the court with its clockwork antics. Once more, the emperor commands the woodland bird to sing. But it is flown. In his rage, the emperor banishes it from his realm. Then Death comes and sits at the emperor's bedside, and steals from him crown and scepter, till, of a sudden, the nightingale returns, and sings, and makes Death relinquish his spoils. And the courtiers who enter expecting to find the monarch dead, find him well and glad in the morning sunshine.

And in his two major works, Petruschka and Le Sacre du Printemps, Strawinsky makes the machine represent his own person. For the actions of machinery woke first in the human organism, and Strawinsky intensifies consciousness of the body by referring these motions to their origin. Petruschka is the man-machine seen from without, seen unsympathetically, in its comic aspect. Countless poets before Strawinsky have attempted to portray the puppet-like activities of the human being, and Petruschka is but one of the recent, innumerable stage-shows that expose the automaton in the human soul. But the puppet-show of Strawinsky is singular because of its musical accompaniment. For more than even the mimes on the stage, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

orchestra is full of the spirit of the automaton. The angular wooden gestures of the dolls, their smudged faces, their entrails of sawdust, are in the music ten times as intensely as they are upon the stage. In the score of Petruschka Music itself has become a little manikin in particolored clothes, at which Strawinsky gazes and laughs as a child laughs at a funny doll, and makes dance and tosses in the air, and sends sprawling. The score is full of the revolutions of wheels, of delicate clock-work movements, of screws and turbines. Beneath the music one always hears the regular insistent maniacal breathing of a concertina. And what in it is not purely mechanistic nevertheless completes the picture of the world as it appears to one who has seen the man machine in its comedy. The stage pictures, the trumpery little fair, the tinsel and pathetic finery of the crowds, the dancing of the human ephemera a moment before the snow begins to fall, are stained marvellously deeply by the music. The score has the colors of crudely dyed, faded bunting. It is the symbol of the whole cheap, flimsy, villainous globe.

Le Sacre, on the other hand, is the man-machine viewed not from without, and unsympathetically, but from within. So far, it is Strawinsky's masterwork, the completest and purest expression of his genius. For the elements that make for the originality of style of Petruschka and the other of Strawinsky's representative compositions, in this work attain a signal largeness and powerfulness. The rhythmic element, already fresh and free in the Scherzo of L'Oiseau de Feu and throughout Petruschka, attains virile and magistral might in it, surges and thunders with giant vigor. The instrumentation, magical with all the magic of the Russian masters in the earlier ballets, in Le Sacre begets that sharpness, hardness, nakedness which is originally Strawinsky's. Besides, the latter work has the thing hitherto lacking somewhat in the young man's art—grandeur and severity and ironness of language. In it, he stands completely new, completely in possession of his powers. And in it the machine operates. Ostensibly, the action of the ballet is laid in prehistoric times. Ostensibly, it figures the ritual with which a tribe of stone age Russians consecrated the spring. Something of the sort was necessary, for an actual representation of machines, a ballet of machines, would not have been as grimly significant as the angular uncouth gestures of men, would by no means have as nakedly revealed the human engine. Here, in the choreography, every fluid, supple, curving motion is suppressed. Everything is angular, cubical, rectilinear. The music pounds with the rhythm of engines. It whirls and spirals like screws and flywheels, grinds and shrieks like laboring metal. The orchestra is transmuted to steel. Each movement of the ballet correlates the rhythms of machinery with the human rhythms which they prolong and repeat. The weird orchestral introduction to the second scene has all the oppressive silence of machines at rest at night. And in the hurtling finale the music and the dancers create a figure that is at once the piston and a sexual symbol. For Strawinsky has stripped away from man all that with which specialization, differentiation, have covered him, and revealed him again, in a sort of cruel white light, a few functioning organs. He has shown him a machine to which power is applied, and which labors in blind obedience, no differently from the microscopic animal that eats and parturates and dies. The spring comes, and life replenishes itself, and man, like seed and germ, obeys the promptings of the blind power that created him, and accomplishes his predestined course and takes in energy and pours it out again. But, for a moment, in Le Sacre du Printemps, we feel the motor forces, watch the naked wheels and levers and arms at work, see the dynamo itself.

The ballet was completed in 1913, the year Strawinsky was thirty-one years old. It may be that the work will be succeeded by others even more original, more powerful. Or it may be that Strawinsky has already written his masterpiece. The works that he has composed during the war are not, it appears, strictly new developments. Whatever enlargement of the field of the string quartet the three little pieces, which the Flonzaleys played here in 1915, created, there is no doubt that it was nothing at all to compare with the innovation in orchestral music created by the great ballet. And, according to rumor, the newest of Strawinsky's work, the music-hall ballet for eight clowns, and the work for orchestra, ballet and chorus entitled Les Noces Villageoises, are by no means as bold in style as Le Sacre, and resemble Petruschka more than the later ballet. But, whatever Strawinsky's future accomplishment, there can be no doubt that with this one work, if not also with Petruschka, he has secured a place among the great musicians. It is doubtful whether any living composer has opened new musical land more widely than he. For he has not only minted music anew. He has reached a point ahead of us that the world would have reached without him. That alone shows him the genius. He has brought into music something for which we had long been waiting, and which we knew must one day arrive. To us, at this moment, Le Sacre du Printemps appears one of those compositions that mark off the musical miles.

PAUL ROSENFELD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Keynes and His Critics

THERE has been no failure anywhere to recognize that Keynes's Economic Consequences of the Peace requires an "answer." Too many complacencies have been assailed by it. If Keynes is right, revenge, chicanery and moral and intellectual obtuseness were the outstanding characteristics of the dominant figures in the Peace Conference. The peace terms they wrought out and imposed upon Germany and her Allies, both territorial and economic, but more flagrantly the latter, were in open violation of the solemn engagements entered upon when the armistice was signed. Not only that; the burden they imposed upon the beaten nations is of such monstrous weight that its only effect would be to make impossible the economic rehabilitation of those nations. Revision or the abandonment of Central Europe to chaos; those are the imperative alternatives, as Keynes sees them. The international menace is so grave, however, that revision of the Treaty alone will not remove it. Positive international action is required besides: the remission of inter-Allied war debts, the removal of economic barriers throughout the Central European area and an international loan for reconstruction purposes.

That, in outline, is Keynes's position. What progress are his critics making in their attack on it? American reviewers agree as a rule in qualifying Keynes's analysis of personal motives in the conference as overdrawn. Wilson was less the victim of bamboozlement by Lloyd George and Clemenceau, more responsive to the spirit of revenge then prevalent in America than Keynes assumes. Responsible reviewers like Young, Taussig and Dulles do not claim that the President's work at Paris was well done, absolutely considered. But they make greater allowance for the circumstances in which it was done.

There is surprisingly little effort made by American reviewers to refute the charge that the Treaty is in many respects in direct violation of the preliminary engagements, nor is anywhere a serious attempt made to show that those engagements were not morally binding. Hazen, writing in the New York Times, quotes the statement that "the German commentators had little difficulty in showing that the draft treaty constituted a breach of engagements and of international morality comparable with their own offense in the invasion of Belgium," and argues that since the invasion of Belgium was an unspeakably immoral act, it can't be that any reasonable man would compare the Treaty with it. But Hazen is pretty thoroughly isolated in his astonishment. Almost everybody else sees in the foisting of pensions and separation allowances into the reparation account a pretty bad business, morally. Young, writing in the New Republic, offers the defence that while "it increases the invisible figures on the blank check Germany has been forced to sign to some forty billions or more," that does not really concern Germany, because no one expects Germany to pay so much. It "has significance largely because it changes the basis on which the payments received are likely to be divided among the claimants." What that means is that the crooked device of inflating the sums Germany was bound to pay under the pre-armistice agreement was directed not against Germany but against France and Belgium. The limit of what Germany could pay would about cover the French and Belgian demands for bona fide reparation, together with reparation for submarine sinkings. The British would have got a relatively small share of what Germany could pay; Canada, South Africa and Australia would have got nothing. By placing pensions and separation allowances on the same footing with damages to civilians and their property, the British cleverly drew to themselves a greater share of any possible indemnity. They exploited the French desire for revenge to skin the French. That does not materially whiten the Treaty, but apparently it is the best that can be done. Incidentally, it is worth noting that there are still Frenchmen who impute Keynes's rage against the inflation of the indemnity charge to pro-Germanism.

What Germany would be required to pay, if the Treaty conformed to the pre-armistice agreement, is a matter subject to differing estimates. Keynes puts the amount tentatively at $10,600,000,000. With all allowance for possible mistakes, the figures, he believes, could hardly fall short of eight billions nor exceed fifteen billions. Young would place the figure nearer twenty billions than $10,600,000,000. Dulles thinks that Keynes underestimates the damages for which Germany is morally liable under the agreement. Neither offers the data, however, on which he bases his dissent. Perhaps that is because it is not so important, practically, to know what Germany ought to pay as to know what she can pay. That amount Keynes places at about ten billions. Against this he would place a credit of two billions and a half for ships and other material surrendered, and exact the remainder in the form of annual instalments of $250,000,000 for thirty years. That

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means, as the writer for the Review emphasizes, a present capital value of much less than seven billions and a half. Reckoning interest at five per cent, thirty such payments have a present value of only $3,850,000,000. Young and Taussig, calculating on the basis of any probable excess of exports over imports that the other industrial nations would permit Germany to develop, place her ability to pay at about ten billions. How much credit they would give for property surrendered is not clear, but as for the rest, they are calculating in terms of present capital values. Accordingly their estimates are materially higher than those of Keynes, although in no sense to be compared with the huge totals on Germany's blank check.

Germany's ability to pay must lie somewhere around ten billions; her liability under the Treaty may run as high as forty billions or more. But the terms and methods of payment are placed in the control of the Reparation Commission, which has the power to postpone payments and even remit them. It is bound to see that Germany is taxing herself as heavily as any Allied nation and that after necessary minimum governmental expenditures, reparation payment shall have precedence over all other liabilities. May we not assure ourselves that the Reparation Commission will use common sense and exact from Germany only what she can pay, and still live? That is the belief of most American critics. Keynes is not so confident of this, although he does not exclude the hypothesis altogether. The Commission has the power to cancel part of the debt or postpone payments for any considerable time, only by unanimous vote. Suppose that German economic recovery turns on such action; are all Germany's rivals eager for her economic recovery? We have recently seen the failure of the project for permitting Germany to raise a priority loan for rehabilitation purposes. The French interposed their veto. Will they become less antagonistic to the development of German economic power as the years go by? It is hard to see why they should.

The indemnity, however, is not immediately the gravest attack upon the German economic system. The Treaty extirpated German business undertakings in much the greater part of the world. It stripped Germany of practically the whole of her shipping. It took away the iron of Lorraine—three-fourths of her production—and the coal fields of the Saar and Silesia—one-third of her present output and perhaps one half of her potential production. It reduced her possibilities of agricultural production by ten per cent, her population by five per cent. These are grave handicaps to recovery, every one admits.

Taussig thinks, however, that we may be taking political boundaries too seriously. He argues that the coal of Silesia will still have to find a market in Germany. There is no other market for it. That is true, perhaps, at present; but if Poland attains to political stability, she will certainly seek to develop industry, to take advantage of the Russian market, and she will not eagerly see cheap coal crossing the frontier to a competitor's shops. Taussig also thinks that some modus vivendi between France and Germany must be reached that will permit Lorraine ore and Westphalian coke to form their natural union. It is true that Saar Valley coke will not take the place of Westphalian, under present technological practice. Sarre coal must be mixed with at least twenty-five per cent of Westphalian or Durham coal to make a satisfactory metallurgical coke. Therefore France may be compelled to give Germany some ore in return for coke, if France really desires to carry on a great steel industry, cheaply. But would not France rather endure higher costs than permit the German iron industry to recover? French commercial policy has never failed to reckon the foreigners' loss as France's gain.

Young thinks that Keynes overestimates the disadvantage Germany incurs from the loss of her shipping. A few years ago our goods were carried in foreign bottoms. Were we at a loss to get our goods shipped? We were not; but we were shipping a different class of goods. We had wheat and meat and cotton and copper and a host of other materials and half manufactured goods. If Germany had such goods the world would go after them, no doubt. But she has not. The exports with which she will pay her indemnity will have to be industrial products, competing directly with British, French, Belgian, American products. That is not saying we will not carry the German products, but we will carry our own first. Just now a mighty protest is going up over the proposal to put our bottoms on the Hamburg-American lines. They would serve German trade, it is asserted, and that we don't like.

We can afford here to dwell for a moment on the conditions that made German trade formidable before the war. There were powerful shipping lines carrying goods cheaply to every port; enterprising business houses to push the goods on the market; great banking houses to finance the trade. All that machinery has been wholly destroyed by the war and the Treaty. Yet we are expecting Germany to do what she has not succeeded in late decades in doing; to sell abroad every year some three or four hundred millions more than she buys, in order to get credits to pay indemnities. Is it possible?

Perhaps it was the deliberate purpose of some of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Treaty makers to keep Germany from recovering her economic footing in a generation. Keynes sees some such purpose in French policy; Simonds insists on it, and justifies it. Young does not believe in any such consistency as the policy implies. Some of the French were specially desirous of punishing Germany, others, of recovering funds to balance a nightmare of a budget. Whatever the motives, the Treaty seems better calculated to produce disintegration than to facilitate recovery. Do we want German disintegration and the consequent revolutionary turmoil of which we are now getting a foretaste? Keynes does not. He wishes to see ordinary economic motives working again in Central and Eastern Europe, repairing, as they inevitably would, the bourgeois state. Therefore Hazen finds Keynes to be a representative of the "Extreme Left," and the Review discerns in him a "slant" in the same direction. But let that pass. What is to be done about it?

Keynes seeks revision, revision through the League. American reviewers seem not optimistic about that. He urges the utmost freedom of trade through the Central European tract. That, thinks Taussig, is Utopian. Keynes would have the Allied powers cancel their debts to one another. Young and Taussig agree that it ought to be done, but are quite sure America would not consent to a cancellation of the ten billion owing her. There are other reviewers who regard the proposal as a piece of British chicanery. But if they sum up the items of Keynes's reckoning they will observe that Britain would pay as much for revision as any other nation. It would be worth Britain's while, as it would probably be worth our while.

The critics have not seriously shaken Keynes's characterization of the Treaty. They have not been able to get far away from agreement with him as to what the Treaty should have been. They admit the desirability of revision. Where their case against him is strongest is in the matter of the practicability of revision. Their pessimism seems to lie nearer to the facts.

ALVIN JOHNSON.

# Learn From Passaic

FROM Passaic one can learn many things about power in the United States. One can learn them by simply noting the results of the fight made against the Passaic Wool Manufacturers' espionage system.

Systems of spies—in some industries—ought really now to be calculated as established items in the costs of the production of goods. Taxes, Insurance Policies, Night Watchmen, Automatic Fire Sprinklers, Spies.

Some spy systems, owned by manufacturers and other private citizens, grew greatly in grace during the war. The federal government labored to convict a lot of anti-employer "radicals" of being anti-government "pro-Germans." Employers in many cases entered happily into the fruits of those labors. They enlisted with their spies to help the government against the government's "enemies from within," and they seem to have enlisted for life. They are our only real "bitter-enders." Mr. Josephus Daniels is not marching with marines through the prostrate cities of the enemies from without. But these employers are still laying a full war-time barrage of espionage on "revolutionary radicals," "red radicals," "destructive radicals,"—and "radicals"—not only to save themselves from strikes but to save the Republic from overthrow.

In Passaic the all-wool private spy system is quite emphatic in regarding itself as a quasi-public institution. Its manager, Mr. J. Frank Andres—Secretary of the Industrial Council of Passaic Wool Manufacturers—printed a page-wide, page-long advertisement on April 27th in which he replied to the attack made on his system by Mrs. Alice Barrows Fernandez of the Bureau of Education of the United States Department of the Interior and in which he said:

"Does not Mrs. Fernandez know that the leading industries of the country were advised by the federal authorities to protect property and ensure the maintenance of order by establishing the very 'system' which she condemns so strongly?"

Note—for future use—the words "protect property" and the words "ensure the maintenance of order." Mr. Andres also said:

"All the information on destructive radicalism placed by us before Governor Runyon at the conference which was held in Trenton last January for combatting destructive radicalism was gathered by people in the employ of the mills."

Note that these people—these private secret-service people—were really also public servants.

It was natural, therefore, that they should spy on a fellow-servant of the Republic—Mrs. Fernandez. If agents of the executive branch of the government at Washington can trail United States

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senators, it is not inappropriate that agents of a woollen council impressed with a public duty should nose along on the foot-prints of a representative of the United States Bureau of Education in order to be sure that we are all travelling on the path of our common patriotism.

Patriotism seems to have passed into a standardized trust phase. It has become a combination and conspiracy in restraint of individual invention of benefits for the state. It will dissolve itself back to individualism or kill the state and itself.

Mr. Andres's private Department of Justice followed Mrs. Fernandez and made a report on her; or else some earnest volunteer snoopers followed her and made the report; and they sent it to headquarters—to Mr. Andres; and Mr. Andres handed this report to Dr. Fred S. Shepherd, Passaic's Superintendent of Schools; but Dr. Shepherd, as I intimated in last week's article, turned out to be an American and not only an Americanizer.

He refused, as he afterwards said in print, to be a "party" to "espionage." He told Mr. Andres that he would arrange a meeting for him with Mrs. Fernandez in order that she might "explain the situation to him for herself"; and he took Mr. Andres's report and gave it to Mrs. Fernandez in order that she might be fully aware of all the circumstances in which she was conducting her investigation in Passaic.

It happened that she was conducting it not only on behalf of the United States government but at the request of the educational authorities of the Passaic government.

On this official emissary of Washington, on this official guest of Passaic, the private reporting system of the Passaic Wool Council, for the purpose of protecting "property" and for the purpose of maintaining "order" made the report which I now proceed to quote in full. It is a perfect report.

It is entitled Reported Activities of Mrs. Alice Borrows—showing the difficulties under which people labor who try to get their information through key-holes. It then passes at once, though still battling against those difficulties, to a declaration of a great social danger. It says:

"This woman, who is reported to be connected with the United States Department of Labor (Educational Division) has been in Passaic some days, and the reports about her activities should be called to the attention of the local Superintendent of Schools. If what is said about her is true, then she is a misguided zealot, of which we have too many in this country."

Note the character of the danger. Zealotry.

*Public* espionage systems cannot very well harry a citizen except on the theory that he is committing a crime. *Private* espionage systems can deal with zealots who have not yet risen to crime. They can catch criminality in the cocoon.

Note also that a "zealot" is a lower animal of "which" we have too many.

The report continues, and gets down to the brass tacks which prick the wool manufacturers:

"According to information received by us this woman appeared at the rooms of the Amalgamated Textile Workers of America on Second Street and had a long and earnest conversation with Matthew Pluhar, the head of this so-called union."

Note that this conversation took place in the rooms of the union, with only Mrs. Fernandez and members of the union present, and yet Mr. Andres can say—and truly—that he knows about it.

Note also that in such documents one never says: "Miss Smith went." One says: "This woman appeared." She shoots up out of a trap-door, and there she is! And the hero crosses the stage and confronts her. "Woman!" Then we are on our guard. We know that in this man's world nobody calls a woman "Woman!" if he likes her.

So now for the plot.

"She [that is, Mrs. Fernandez] is reported to have declared that Mr. Shepherd [the Superintendent of Schools] had agreed to the plan proposed by Dunn of the Amalgamated, which is to have a committee of the workers representing the different nationalities select the men who shall qualify as teachers of the workers. The idea is to teach the English language and other subjects to the foreign population. It was suggested to Mrs. Borrows that the method used in teaching English to the foreigners was archaic and that the entire system should be revolutionized." Yes. That's the plot.

It may seem a bit unusual, but one needn't be discouraged. One needn't leave the house. Trust the author. The denouement will be the same as usual. It comes.

"To us," says the Andres report, "to us"—that is, to people who are not zealots but calm—"it seems that the method suggested would turn the school-rooms of Passaic into breeding-places for Bolshevists."

Ah! A sigh of relief. At this point in the play the Bolshevists always win. Against all obstacles they win. School-rooms. Public school-rooms. Janitors knocking about. The principal of the school looking in. The Superintendent of Schools supervising and inspecting. Lights. But the Bolsheviks win. They win in dark cellars; because there they make bombs. And they win if you drag them out; because then they talk. In this case they win by the mere substitution of a word.

The author looks out for the substitution. He

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has already reported—as the reader will remember—that the plot in the rooms of the Amalgamated Textile Workers was that the "workers"—of "different nationalities"—would select the teachers. But watch him. He goes on. He says next:

"The radicals will select the teachers."

Then all is lost. Then:

"Under the guise of teaching English, radical thoughts and doctrines can be promulgated."

You can see. The teacher would give out the lesson: "The hus-band of the sis-ter of the Congress-man is the son-in-law of the prof-i-teer and does not believe in the dic-ta-tor-ship of the pro-le-tar-i-at." What would the school authorities do?

The author begins to be appalled by it himself. He says:

"This appears to be a very supple scheme."

But he goes to the mat with it. He downs it. Supple as it is, he wrenches its secret from it. And the plot is solved.

"Mrs. Borrows," says Mr. Andres, "seems to have fallen under the influence of the propagandists."

Good Heavens! Of course! Those are the people who rescue all these plots. They come on in the second act.

In the first act everybody believes in Americanism. But then in the second act a fellow comes on with a hypodermic needle and mingles with the crowd. And then in the third act you find people believing in municipal ownership of gas-plants and in letting foreigners learn English from teachers of their own choosing.

But in the fourth act the expert in Americanism arrives from detective headquarters or the National Civic Federation. He lamps the hypodermic needle or book or leaflet in the stranger's pocket. He snatches it. He looks at it. It is an argument. He pales. With his powerful hands he shatters it to bits. He advances on the stranger. "I know how you won this woman—this poor woman—this lady." His right fist flashes or flames out. The stranger falls asleep. "Leave him lay. He was a propagandist!" The stage is flooded with light. The whole cast assumes an expression of intelligence and perfect understanding, which communicates itself to the audience. Curtain—Columbia weeping repentantly in the arms of a clean upstanding opponent of compulsory health insurance.

It is a sure-fire play, but Mrs. Fernandez was a poor Columbia.

She objected to her lines, and she went and complained to the managers, in the Wool Council. So next we will study the behavior of great men in a great industry when confronted with a mishap in their practice of espionage. WILLIAM HARD.

# Who Are the Conscientious Objectors?

THE conscientious objector has been one of the most discussed types of personality made prominent by the war. In mere quantity of words written about him one must go, for comparison, to the Legion of Honor or to those intrepid forerunners of attack, the "shock troops." Yet in all the discussion that has centered about his head, there has been little if any attempt to present him in the light of impersonal observation and fact; for the most part, people have drawn their opinions from preconceptions or, at best, from evidence received at second-hand. It is now possible, however, to give the results of a scientific study of the intelligence of the conscientious objector, a study pursued by methods as free from personal bias as any method of human observation can be. The conclusions of this study lie buried in the archives of the War Department, whence I am able to rescue them by virtue of the official permission recently given to me to investigate conditions under which military prisoners were confined. In making the facts public, I believe that I am adding an important contribution to the body of knowledge necessary before one can adequately answer the question: Who is the conscientious objector?

In January and February, 1919, there were nearly five hundred conscientious objectors at the United States Disciplinary Barracks, or military prison, at Forth Leavenworth, Kansas. It so happened that during those two months the Surgeon General's Office of the War Department conducted a class in "disciplinary psychiatry" at the barracks. One of the tasks of this class was to make a psychological and mental study of all barracks inmates.

Most of the officers who made this study were psychologists or psychiatrists in civil life and were, therefore, thoroughly competent to make it. They used the same methods that the army had used in its examination of drafted men; the tests employed were the same that had been so successfully applied to two million soldiers. These tests, comprising both the so-called alpha and beta groups, involved the use of concrete material and pantomime, as well as of printed matter, so that the results were independent of the tested person's acquaintance with the English language and even of his schooling. Before these modern measuring rods of intelligence a man stands intellectually naked. He comes to the examination with only such mental resources and equipment as his Creator endowed him with, plus those spontaneously ac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quired powers that life itself brings; some of the best records have been achieved by men who had not completed the eighth grade. The purpose of the tests is to put men into one or another intelligence group. They furnish a "fairly reliable index," according to the description of them published for army officers, of a man's "ability to learn, to think quickly and accurately, to analyze a situation, to maintain a state of mental alertness, and to comprehend and follow instructions." Among their specific achievements, they have aided in the discovery of persons whose superior intelligence suggested their consideration for advancement; in forming organizations of uniform mental strength, where such uniformity was desired, and of superior mental strength, where superiority was needed; in selecting men for special assignments; in distinguishing the mentally slow from the stubborn or disobedient; and in discovering those whose low grade intelligence rendered them a burden to the service. So useful have they been found, and so trustworthy is the light they shed upon a man's general intelligence, that colleges and universities, notably Columbia University, have substituted them for the traditional entrance examinations that candidates for admission have heretofore been required to pass.

Seven ratings are ordinarily used in applying these tests. These ratings are based upon a scientific determination of the "mental age" corresponding to a given age in years, but the ordinary description of the ratings is better for our purpose. According to this, grade A includes those who possess "very superior intelligence"; grade B, "superior intelligence"; grade C+, "high average intelligence"; grade C, "average intelligence"; grade C—, "low average intelligence"; grade D, "inferior intelligence"; and grades D— and E, "very inferior intelligence". The ratings assigned to a "theoretical normal company" by army psychologists are as follows: grade A, 5 per cent; B, 15 per cent; C+, 15 per cent; C, 30 per cent; C—, 15 per cent; D, 15 per cent; D—, 5 per cent; and E, none.

The first result of the examination of Fort Leavenworth prisoners was to make possible a comparison between the main body of prisoners and the conscientious objectors. For purposes of tabulation, the objectors were divided into three groups, (1) objectors on political grounds, (2) objectors on religious grounds, and (3) a miscellaneous assortment comprising "objectors because of being alien enemies, of having alien enemy relatives, of non-citizenship, and other like draft irregularities." Two thousand four hundred and sixteen general prisoners were examined. Of these 6.8 per cent earned ratings in grade A. This is slightly above the record of the theoretical normal company. Of the political objectors examined, 39.3 per cent earned ratings in grade A; of the religious objectors, 12.8 per cent; and of the third group of objectors, 1.5 per cent. Thus, it will be seen that the group of political conscientious objectors at Fort Leavenworth contained, proportionately, six times as many persons of "very superior intelligence" as did the main body of inmates; that the religious objectors contained twice as many; and that the third group—composed largely of men only technically classed as objectors because they did not want to fight against their own countries or for other reasons—contained only one-fourth as many.

The comparison was extended to other army groups. Of approximately 20,000 white men drafted and sent to Camp Lee in one month, 3.8 per cent made grade A. Of 82,000 enlisted men, all literate, for whom ratings were tabulated, 6 per cent made grade A. Of over 3,000 sergeants, 21 per cent made grade A. And of 9,000 candidates for officers' training corps, 37 per cent made grade A. The showing of the political objectors is better than any of these, whereas the religious objectors excelled both the drafted and enlisted men but fell behind the sergeants and candidates for officers' training corps. Indeed, it is not until one comes to the commissioned officers of the United States Army that he finds the political objectors excelled. Of nearly 9,000 of these for whom tabulation was made, 48 per cent earned ratings in grade A.

The superiority of the commissioned officers is not without its flaw, however. A special study was made of those conscientious objectors who, at the time of the examination, had refused to do any work in the military prison. These men were "absolutists," who carried their opposition to military service to the farthest extreme. They were looked upon by most of the officers at Fort Leavenworth as incorrigible and contemptible persons, deserving the worst punishments that could be inflicted upon them. As a consequence, they spent consecutive weeks in solitary confinement, with their hands shackled to the bars of their cells for nine hours a day and with only bread and water for food, rather than yield their convictions in any degree. Of the seventeen political objectors in this group, 59 per cent earned ratings in grade A, excelling the group of commissioned officers of the United States Army by 11 per cent. The twenty religious objectors made a poorer showing. Ten per cent of their number earned ratings in the first grade, a slightly lower record than that which was made

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by religious objectors who did not refuse to work.

To these figures it may be answered that a comparison based on one grade is no criterion of the general level of intelligence of the various groups. This is true. The criticism can be met, however, by combining the percentages of those who earned ratings in the first four grades, since those grades include all marked "average" or better. This gives the following table:

| Groups Compared | Percentages showing "average" and better than "average" intelligence |
|---|---|
| Theoretical Normal Company ..... | 65 |
| Approximately 20,000 white men drafted and sent to Camp Lee in one month ..... | 45.1 |
| Enlisted privates, all literate,—82,936 | 68 |
| Sergeants—3,393 ..... | 95 |
| Candidates for Officers' Training Corps—9,240 ..... | 94 |
| Commissioned Officers—8,819 ..... | 97 |
| Political Objectors—84 ..... | 82.2 |
| Religious Objectors—218 ..... | 81.4 |
| Objectors who were "alien enemies," etc.—135 ..... | 27.3 |

Many people who were familiar with the kind of newspaper comment on conscientious objectors that was current during the war will probably be surprised to learn that fewer than eighteen per cent of political objectors and nineteen per cent of religious objectors fell below the "average" in intelligence. Moreover, those who did fall below earned ratings in grade C— or D, so that none of them had "very inferior" intelligence. The table shows that both political and religious objectors excelled their fellow-inmates at Fort Leavenworth, the white draft at Camp Lee, the theoretical normal company and the enlisted men; in other words, they excelled their own associates both in prison and camp. When the comparison is made upon the basis of the first four grades, the conscientious objectors are excelled by the sergeants, the candidates for officers' training corps and the commissioned officers.

Conscientious objectors in prison differed in no essential respect, so far as I know, from other objectors. True, they pushed their opposition to military service farther than others, but I think it would be false to assume any marked dissimilarity between the idealism of the two, between the integrity of their moral purposes or the quality of their mental attributes; many of those in prison, indeed, were members of the same religious sects as those who remained outside, or drew their opinions from the same social and humanitarian philosophies. It is not unlikely, therefore, that any deductions concerning the intelligence of the one group would hold good for the other.

Another sidelight is thrown upon conscientious objectors by this study. Not long ago an army officer declared that when conscientious objectors were released from prison they would make "the worst possible kind of criminals." Unless this effect has been produced by their confinement itself, the statement may be dismissed as not true. A study of the previous delinquency records of barracks inmates showed that over 40 per cent of the main body of prisoners had been convicted for offences in civil life, largely drunkenness, disorderly conduct, etc. Only 6.7 per cent of conscientious objectors had been convicted for such offences. Moreover, over 10 per cent of the other inmates had served terms in prisons or reformatories for more serious offences, whereas only *six-tenths of one per cent* of conscientious objectors—two or three individuals at most—had served such terms. It does not seem likely that we need to fear much from the future criminal activity of conscientious objectors.

WINTHROP D. LANE.

# Centralia

THE verdict of the jury in the trial of eleven I. W. W.'s at Montesano, Washington, marks the end of one chapter in the reign of lawlessness that culminated in the tragedy at Centralia on Armistice Day, November 11, 1919.

A parade made up of various civic and fraternal orders, and several divisions of ex-service men, was a part of the day's celebration. The parade marched north on Tower Avenue to Third Street where it turned and retraced its steps along the opposite side of the avenue. The Chehalis division of ex-service men had just crossed Second Street, and the front of the Centralia division had almost reached Second Street when the parade stopped. The newly opened I. W. W. hall was located on Tower Avenue between Second and Third Streets, about one hundred and fifty feet from the corner of Second so that when the Centralia division stopped, a part of it was directly in front of the I. W. W. hall.

In the twinkling of an eye, doors are smashed, windows crash, shots are fired, men fall dead or wounded, and the crowd is scattered in every direction. To tell what actually happened and the order of occurrence required nearly three hundred witnesses in the trial just closed, and the testimony was so hopelessly in conflict on important points that there are wide differences of opinion still. The state contended that the parade, in making the turn on Tower Avenue, became somewhat disorganized

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that the Centralia division was halted to close up ranks. That while the men in the front ranks were marking time, and those in the rear ranks closing up, the paraders were fired upon from four places without the slightest provocation. These four places, it was alleged, were the Arnold and Avalon hotels, located across the street from the I. W. W. hall and a little to the north and south respectively; Seminary Ridge, an elevation of ground about a thousand feet east of and overlooking Tower Avenue; and the I. W. W. hall.

The defense contended that the parade was stopped in front of the I. W. W. hall as part of a preconceived plan to drive out the I. W. W., which plan was formulated by a committee of the Citizens' Protective League, an offshoot of the Manufacturers' and Employers' Association, and that the leaders of the Centralia ex-service men were cognizant of this plan though the rank and file knew nothing of it. It was further contended, by the defense, that an officer on horseback galloped ahead to the Chehalis division which had passed the hall, and after blowing a whistle, asked "Aren't you fellows in on this?" That, as soon as the parade stopped, a rush was made upon the I. W. W. hall from the ranks in the streets, and that no shots were fired from the Arnold hotel, though it was admitted shots were fired from Seminary Ridge and not denied that they were fired from the Avalon hotel, but it was claimed they were all fired in self-defense and in defense of property.

The shooting resulted, in addition to wounding several, in the killing of four ex-service men, one of them being Warren O. Grimm, who was in charge of the Centralia division, and for whose death the defendants were tried. Following the shooting, everyone in the neighborhood suspected of being an I. W. W. was rounded up, and for days armed men searched the surrounding country for fugitives. Eleven men were finally charged with the murder of Grimm. Britt Smith, McInerney, Becker, Sheehan, Faulkner, Tom Morgan, and Everest were captured in or near the I. W. W. hall. Morgan turned state's evidence and was not placed on trial, and Everest was taken from the city jail that night and, after being cruelly abused, was lynched.

Those charged with shooting from Seminary Ridge were Bert Bland, Loren Roberts, and Ole Hanson (a fugitive). From the Avalon hotel, it was alleged, the firing was done by Eugene Barnett and one Davis (a fugitive), and from the Arnold hotel by O. C. Bland and John Lamb. The state did not contend that Sheehan, Faulkner, or Morgan did any shooting, though it was contended Sheehan expressed a willingness to use a gun, but was so awkward with it that it was taken from him. All of them, however, with the exception of Morgan, were charged with being present and participants in the discussion of plans preliminary to the stationing of the men and the shooting. Elmer Smith, an attorney, who was arrested in his office, was charged with being an accessory because of advice he was alleged to have given as to the right of defense and the formulation of the defense plans.

When the defendants were arraigned on November 21st before the Superior Court of Lewis County they pleaded not guilty and asked for a change of venue on the ground that the feeling against them in Lewis County made a fair trial impossible. Judge George D. Abel, of Gray's Harbor County, was called in to hear the arguments on the motion for a change of venue, and granted the change to Gray's Harbor County, where he is one of the two Superior judges. Twelve days later the prosecution filed what was in substance an affidavit of prejudice against Judge Abel, on the ground that his brother had been retained as "special prosecutor" and asked the Court to request Governor Hart to designate a trial judge. No reason has been assigned as to why the other judge in Gray's Harbor County could not try the case. Governor Hart then designated Judge John M. Wilson, of Thurston County (Olympia) to try the case, and at once the defense argued for separate trials for the men and a further change of venue on the ground of prejudice.

Gray's Harbor County is in the heart of the lumber section of the state and the lumber region has been the scene of constant friction with the I. W. W., and much bitterness has resulted therefrom. Evidence was cited to show that some of the newspapers published in the county were extreme in their condemnation of the I. W. W., and hand bills were introduced to show that the citizens called to jury duty were urged to insist on the death penalty if the defendants were found guilty. Under the law of the state the death penalty is optional with the jury.

Judge Wilson denied the request for separate trials, but intimated he was disposed to grant a change of venue if it was made clear to him that a second change was possible under the law and precedents. After argument this change was decided upon but the judge expressed doubt as to whether to remove the case to Pierce County (Tacoma) or to Thurston County (Olympia). On further consideration, however, he reversed his decision, saying that at the time he had agreed to a change of venue he had in mind the civil rather than the criminal law and that the showing of prejudice was not sufficient. The defense offered to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make this showing more complete but the offer was denied and the case set for trial in Gray's Harbor County (Montesano).

The attorney for the defense was George F. Vanderveer who has become widely known through his defense of the I. W. W.'s at Everett, Chicago, and other places. Vanderveer is a lawyer of experience, ability, and shrewdness, and during the past several months has been almost constantly in court defending I. W. W.'s throughout the West. Almost single-handed he has had to fight their legal battles; not because there is a scarcity of lawyers—far from it—but because very many of the Bar Associations, as was the case in Lewis County, have passed resolutions practically forbidding any of their members to defend the I. W. W.

The attorneys for the state made up a formidable array in numbers and talent. In the actual trial of the case the work of prosecution was in the hands of W. H. Abel, of Montesano, and C. D. Cunningham, of Centralia, skilled trial lawyers who have had large experience in handling cases for the lumber interests of their localities. They were assisted by Prosecuting Attorney Allen, of Lewis County, and Attorney-General Thompson and a couple of assistants from this office.

Nearly four hundred taxpayers of the county were called for jury duty. Many of these were excused, of course, because of sickness, pressing business, and other good reasons, and most of the women called took advantage of their statutory exemption and were excused. Of the remainder, ninety-three were examined before a jury was secured. The laws of Washington provide that whenever the case is likely to be long drawn-out the judge may order the calling of one or two alternate jurors, and Judge Wilson ordered two alternates in this case. These alternates hear the evidence as the regular jurors do, and the case had not gone very far when one of the regular jurors fell ill and one of the alternates was substituted for him. The other alternate was dismissed just before the jury retired to reach a verdict. A little more than two weeks were consumed in securing the jury.

The state, by the evidence introduced, tried to show that no raid had been made on the I. W. W. hall until after the ex-service men had been fired upon, and nearly two score of witnesses testified more or less positively in confirmation of this contention. The defense, on this issue, contradicted the State's evidence emphatically and positively, and by about an equal number of witnesses. The witnesses for both sides were paraders and spectators. Men standing side by side in the ranks saw diametrically opposite occurrences and the spectators were no more agreed.

The State attempted to prove that Grimm was killed by a 38.55 rifle bullet that was fired from a window of the Avalon hotel by Eugene Barnett, and a long array of witnesses took the stand to piece together this contention. The defense attempted to prove that Barnett was not in the Avalon hotel at the time, but was in the Roderick hotel, and while the shooting from the Avalon was not denied, the inference was that it was done by one Davis, a fugitive.

The State alleged that O. C. Bland and John Lamb hired a room for the purpose and fired on the paraders from the Arnold hotel, the defense admitting everything but the firing. Bland took the stand and explained that when the hall was raided he pushed his gun through the window to shoot, but in doing so, he cut his hand so severely that he could not shoot. Lamb, who was unarmed, corroborated him.

Of the men who stationed themselves on Seminary Ridge, one admitted shooting into the paraders after they had begun the raid on the hall, one was a fugitive, and the third one, Loren Roberts, confessed. Vanderveer attempted to rule out Roberts's confession on the ground of insanity but the court overruled him, holding that an attempt to prove Roberts's insanity affected "the weight to be attached to the evidence rather than its competency." To prove insanity, an alienist who had been for years in charge of one of the State Hospitals for the Insane, testified that in his opinion Roberts was at that time insane. The State called two alienists and three local practitioners who expressed the belief that Roberts was sane.

Nobody denied the shooting from the I. W. W. hall but the important question was, did it occur before the raid? Or did it occur after the raid and was it in self-defense against the raiders? As has been indicated, testimony was hopelessly in conflict.

The State's case, in showing a conspiracy to kill, was built up around the confession of Roberts and the confession and testimony of Morgan. Morgan denied he was an I. W. W. and explained his presence, before and during the shooting, in the I. W. W. hall by saying that he was broke and went there to get the price of meals and bed from Ray Becker. He testified that he heard more or less talk of plans of defense although he was a perfect stranger to all but Becker, whom he had known but a few days. He was offered a gun when the guns were distributed, but did not take one. He had heard Attorney Smith talk in low tones to Britt Smith and saw the latter point across the street and say in answer to a question, that he had plenty of men. Morgan remained in the hall until driven out by the raiders. He swore positively that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shooting began before the raid and that he fled while the shooting was going on. He stuck firmly to his story, and on cross-examination said he did not know whether he was charged with murder or not, had never inquired. He had been in jail since November 11th, and was never told, nor had he inquired, why. He declared no promises had been made him and he had no expectations as to whether he would be released or not. The defense tried to show that Morgan's confession was the result of his having seen Everest beaten and abused before he was lynched, but all these attempts were ruled out.

A number of unusual events connected with the trial are evidence of the tension and interest involved. From the very beginning of the trial, a large part of the audience had been made up of ex-service men—soldiers and sailors—in uniform. It is presumed these were there for their moral effect. Shortly after the defense began its case, a detachment of United States troops were sent from Camp Lewis and pitched their tents near the Courthouse. The defense vigorously protested against the presence of the soldiers as a form of insidious propaganda. Upon investigation by Judge Wilson, it appeared that the prosecution had asked for the troops through the governor of the state without consulting the court or the sheriff, both of whom denied the need for troops. The court refused to ask for the removal of the troops on the ground that he had not been consulted as to their coming and would not try to have them sent back to camp.

The presence of the ex-service men in large numbers, the charges that the interests behind the prosecution were anti-labor, and the intensity of feeling throughout the section, led a number of labor organizations to send delegates to watch the trial, and these were called "The Labor Jury." They took a very active interest in the trial throughout and formulated a "verdict" or report in which they unanimously decided the defendants were not guilty, that the I. W. W. hall was unlawfully raided before a shot was fired, that Grimm was party to a conspiracy to run out the I. W. W., and, finally, that the men did not get a fair trial because the court had ruled out material evidence tending to show a conspiracy to raid the hall. This latter contention grew out of the offer of Vanderveer to show in detail the connection between the business interests and the plan to raid the hall. He had shown, in part, that appeals had been made on behalf of the I. W. W. for the protection of the regularly constituted offices of the law, and that nothing had come of these appeals. He offered to show that the proposed raid was so widely known that it had been discussed in the Lewis County Trades Union Council, representing about twenty-five unions.

All this, Vanderveer contended, was material in order to get the frame of mind of the defenders of the hall. He claimed they had a perfect right to defend their hall which was technically the home of Britt Smith, the Secretary of the I. W. W. Judge Wilson ruled that inasmuch as the defendants were on trial for the murder of Grimm alone, it was incumbent upon the defense to show that an overt act had been committed by Grimm, or, that he was directly connected with a conspiracy to raid the hall and that there was an overt act on the part of some of the conspirators, before any evidence of a conspiracy among the business interests was competent.

This Vanderveer could not do to the satisfaction of the court. Two witnesses testified that they saw a large man in uniform near the door of the I. W. W. hall and thought it was Grimm, though they would not swear positively it was Grimm. It is significant to note that they were promptly arrested for perjury upon leaving the courtroom. The failure to connect definitely Grimm with an overt act shut out a mass of testimony and probably shortened the trial by a week.

Judge Wilson instructed the jury that the law of self-defense did not authorize the placing of armed men in outside positions "in the defense of persons, habitations, or property inside the habitation." And if the jury found that persons were stationed in these outside positions and shot upon the raiders, they were guilty of unlawful acts, and that if any two or more of them carried out such a plan and the death of Grimm resulted as a "natural, necessary, or probable result" such killing was murder.

The jury, after an all-day's deliberation, returned a verdict which was not accepted by the court because Barnett and Lamb were found guilty of murder in the third degree (manslaughter), although the court had instructed them the verdict must be murder in the first or in the second degree or acquittal. Two hours further deliberation brought a verdict of guilty in the second degree for Barnett, Lamb, McInerney, Becker, Bert Bland, O. C. Bland, and Britt Smith. Faulkner had been discharged by the court when the State rested its case. Elmer Smith and Sheehan were found not guilty by the jury and Roberts was declared insane.

Neither side was satisfied with the verdict which was manifestly a compromise. The State promptly arrested all the defendants preparatory to trying them for the murder of another ex-service man killed at the same time. The defense will move for a new trial and undoubtedly an appeal will be taken to test out the court's interpretation of self-defense, the necessity of proving an overt act on Grimm's part, and other minor points of contention, of which there are a great number. E. M.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# CORRESPONDENCE

## Mr. Pivány to Mr. Bagger

SIR: I wish to enter a vigorous protest in your columns against the venomous diatribe of Mr. Eugene S. Bagger published in The New Republic of March 17th under the title Admiral Horthy, Dictator. His statements are garbled and in several cases wholly untrue, and the mischievous object of the whole article obviously is to stir up religious hatred against an unfortunate, war- and revolution ridden nation which is desperately trying to get on its feet.

To begin with, there is no resemblance between Kolchak and Horthy beyond the unimportant fact that both had been admirals. Horthy may have been—as Mr. Bagger states—a dictator de facto before the National Assembly elected him regent. In a state of revolution, when there is no representative legislative body, this is surely no crime. At present his power as chief executive is circumscribed by the legislature, over the election of which, as will be seen later, he exercised no control.

To get information about things Hungarian from the Vienna Arbeiter-Zeitung is as exciting a sport as to get enlightenment on American affairs from Mr. Bottomley's John Bull or get the true inwardness of German politics from the columns of a Paris boulevard paper. It was the Arbeiter-Zeitung which circulated the malicious lies about the bodies of six thousand Hebrews and Socialists having been cast up by the Danube and about the "white" army of Horthy conducting pogroms in western Hungary, upon which Mr. Bagger bases his savage attacks against Horthy, the Hungarian government and even Count Apponyi. Yet these lies have been emphatically denied by an unbiassed and competent authority: the American Mission in Budapest, which started at once an investigation headed by an American officer of Jewish faith. In his report, which was submitted to the State Department, this American officer stated that the newspaper reports of the persecution of the Jews in western Hungary were grossly exaggerated. Some instances of maltreatment had occurred; they were, however, not only not done or instigated by the authorities, but the authorities were doing their best to bring the ringleaders to account and to prevent the recurrence of such lawlessness.

Mr. Bagger quotes as a characteristic case that Dr. William Vázsonyi, founder of the Democratic party and one of the most brilliant Jewish lawyers and politicians in Hungary, declared in his Vienna refuge (whither he had fled not from Horthy's, but from Béla Kun's dictatorship, which Mr. Bagger should have made clear) that "under the prevailing conditions he did not consider it safe to return if elected, and announced his decision to retire from Hungarian politics and settle in Switzerland."

Perfectly true. But it is also true—which Mr. Bagger, for reasons of his own, withheld from his readers—that Admiral Horthy, on learing of Dr. Vázsonyi's intention, sent him a personal telegram asking him to return to Budapest and assuring him of his determination to do everything in his power to prevent lawlessness. Dr. Vázsonyi did return to Budapest and took active part in the campaign. That no harm befell either him or his numerous constituents is shown by the fact that he received 9,991 votes against 4,626 cast for his Christian Nationalist opponent. Moreover, Vázsonyi's little Democratic party came out of the elections with twice the number of seats it had had in the old Parliament.—That is the kind of an anti-Semite and reactionary Admiral Horthy is.

Concerning the elections to the National Assembly, Mr. Bagger is also most emphatically wrong. The elections were held on the basis of practically unrestricted male and female suffrage, and, for the first time in the history of parliamentary elections, *voting was compulsory*. Those, who could show no good reason for abstaining from voting were fined. In Budapest alone 300,000 votes were cast, which is about one third of the pre-war population of that city. Several members of the Cabinet and all the candidates of the Independence party (the former Károlyi party) which was represented in the Cabinet, went down to defeat, as did also such experts in finance and economics as former Premier Wekerle, Mr. Hegedüs and Mr. Ebert, which goes to show that the Government did not control the elections. That picturesque swashbuckler, Mr. Friedrich, who seems to have been a favorite with the newly enfranchised women, was elected in three districts, but he has been forced out of the Cabinet and public life since, so it is to be hoped he will no longer disturb Mr. Bagger's sensibilities.

It is most unfortunate that the Socialists, discouraged by the chicanery of petty officials and the hostile attitude of the general public, withdrew all their candidates. At the very best, they could have got only four or five mandates in the outskirts and suburbs of the capital, which is not much. But it would be better for all concerned if they could express their opinions inside the Parliament than outside of it.

Under present conditions it is easy and profitable to write articles and—as Mr. Bagger threatens—even books abusing prostrate Hungary, while he who writes the truth can find no publisher and can count himself lucky if a "letter to the editor" occasionally find its way into print. But Mr. Bagger, no matter what private injuries he may nurse, should be the last to take advantage of this opportunity for traducing Hungary, for he is a native of that country, and it is a bad bird that befouls its own nest.

EUGENE PIVANY.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

## Mr. Bagger to Mr. Pivány

SIR: The central contention of my article was that the pledges given to Sir George Clerk by the Horthy-Huszar-Friedrich government were shamelessly broken as soon as the Allied representative turned his back; 1, by forcing the two Social Democrats out of the "coalition" cabinet; 2, by insuring "free, impartial and democratic" elections by means of locking up at least 40,000 dissenters in internment camps, among them, naturally, those leaders who were at the moment neither in prison nor in exile. The silence with which such a prominent spokesman of American-Hungarian White sympathisers as Mr. Pivány passes over the entire subject of internments is the most eloquent corroboration of my charge, and Mr. Pivány may rest assured of my thanks for this entirely unlooked-for help.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Pivány's nearest approach to the question of governmental terrorism during the elections is his statement that the Socialists were "discouraged" by the "chicanery of petty officials." This, I take it, is the White euphemistic way of saying that the floggings were administered not by generals and colonels, but by mere sergeants of the White terror troops.

In the light of his tacit admission of my most important assertion all other objections, save two, raised by Mr. Pivány, are either irrelevant or simply amusing. His harangue against the Vienna Arbeiter-Zeitung, one of the very few European journals that have passed the ordeal of the last five years with a most enviable reputation for truth-telling, is but an attempt at begging the question.

One of Mr. Pivány's two charges which in my view call for serious consideration, relates to the case of Dr. Vázsonyi. I am unaware that Dr. Vászonyi returned to Budapest with a safe conduct granted by Admiral Horthy; it may be true, though I have reason not to believe it. At any rate, the fact that a politician of his conservative views dare not return without such safe conduct characterizes the situation better than Horthy's diplomatic improvization. But Mr. Pivány states an untruth knowingly when he attributes Vázsonyi's absence from Budapest to the Red Terror. True, Vázsonyi had originally left the capital during the Communist régime, but returned immediately after its overthrow. He had to flee again, however, when his home was repeatedly raided at night by White officers; if he was not seized it is merely due to the fact that he spent his nights in hiding in another section of the town. He left Budapest in November, after applying for and receiving an escort of two French officers. Immediately a warrant was issued for his arrest. The train on which he travelled was held up and searched by White soldiers at Bruck, on the Austrian frontier; and he was only saved by the vigorous intervention of his French escort.

Secondly, Mr. Pivány makes much of the report of an "American officer of Jewish faith," stating that the newspaper accounts of the persecution of Jews in western Hungary were "grossly exaggerated." The truth is as follows: The American officer in question, Colonel H., made a forty-eight-hour investigation trip to Siofok, then Admiral Horthy's headquarters. His coming being duly heralded, the White officers made haste in transferring the prisoners bearing the worst signs of maltreatment to out-of-the-way villages, and told the remaining victims that if they complained they would be killed as soon as Colonel H. was off. The unfortunates were exhorted by Captain Freisberger, in charge of the camp, as follows: "Remember, that American Jew will leave in a few hours, but I am going to stay." Relatives of murdered Jews were intimidated in a similar fashion. So, when Colonel H. (an honorable, kind-hearted gentleman with the best intentions in the world) appeared on the scene, everything was arranged for his reception. He found nothing extraordinary, and reported back to that effect. Whereupon murder and torture began anew.

The truth about the Siofok horrors was revealed by Stephen Hayden, a sergeant of the old Hungarian army. He was employed as a gaoler at the camp, and when he "knew too much," the Whites locked him up and threatened him with execution. Escaping to Budapest, he reported the most appalling conditions to Colonel James T. Loree and Captain Bernath Weiss of the American mission. His story was published in the Budapest newspapers Nepszava and Pesti Elet; later he fled to Prague. His testimony was corroborated by several other eye-witnesses, among whom I refer Mr. Pivány to that White officer whose Siofok experiences were anonymously published in the November twentieth issue of the Vienna weekly Az Ember, edited by Magyar refugees whose trustworthiness can be vouchsafed.

The authenticity of my statements concerning Dr. Vázsonyi and the Siofok inquiry is attested by the above named Captain Bernath Weiss, late of the United States Army, who for nearly a year was attached to various American missions at Budapest. He is now a practicing physician in Brooklyn, N. Y.

On Mr. Pivány's style of controversy I need not comment; it speaks for itself. With the gentlemen who today plead the cause of the Hungarian White terrorists before the American public, personal insinuations have always been a favorite substitute for argument. By imputing my attitude to motives of personal gain and resentment, Mr. Pivány merely bares his own mentality. Finally, if patriotism implies the obligation to defend and eulogize the actions of a gang of criminals who happen to have seized, by the foulest of means, the government of one's country, then, indeed, I shall gladly cede to Mr. Pivány and his friends a monopoly of that virtue.

EUGENE S. BAGGER.

New York City.

## The Spoliation of Bulgaria

SIR: The Paris conference is the tragedy of our generation, a sort of Congress of Vienna over again. And with much less excuse, for the nineteenth century peace muddlers were ignorant, whereas President Wilson and his colleagues had before them an abundance of accurate information on the problems that they assumed to settle.

The spoliation of Bulgaria, for example, is very certain to motivate a Balkan war in the very near future. Three-fourths of the Macedonian vilayets are peopled by Bulgarians and all the Macedonian areas were given to Greece and Jugo-Slavia by the Paris Peace disturbers. The sandjak of Dobrudja, inhabited by a mixed Bulgarian and Turkish population, has been confirmed to Rumania. And the Jugo-Slavia eastern frontier has been brought to the very gates of the capital of Bulgaria, not because these cazas have a Serbian population, but because the hills overlooking the city of Sofia must be commanded by Serbian garrisons so that they may smash the capital to smithers if the Bulgars show the slightest disposition to disregard the policies of their western neighbor. This, at any rate, is the explanation offered by the apologists of the Treaty of Neuilly.

Bulgaria made a mistake by joining the Central powers. But she was forced to take this action by the autocratic Tsarist Russian government. If England, rather than Russia, could have handled the differences between Serbia and Bulgaria, the latter would unquestionably have cast her lot with the Allies. When she quit the war, Bulgaria looked hopefully to America. But President Wilson did not stiffen his back at Paris and demand an equitable settlement of the Macedonian question. Greek money, and French greed interacted at Paris and sold the Bulgars. And to this iniquity Lloyd George, to placate France, and President Wilson, for no known reason, assented.

If the mistakes of Paris are to be corrected, I am convinced that the initiative must be taken by Americans.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. David Starr Jordan in a recent communication in your columns called attention to the immediate need of its revision. Cannot American public opinion be educated in this matter? England, much as she may wish to see the Bulgarian wrongs righted, cannot take the lead. She lies cheek by jowl with France and is up against her in every quarter of the globe. She is forever "suspect." We are under no such bonds and we are above suspicion. And we ought to want a just and lasting settlement of the Balkan problems.

WILLIAM S. MONROE.

Montclair, New Jersey.

## Hoover as Great White Father

SIR: I have read with much interest A. C. Freeman's letter in the New Republic. With much of what your correspondent says I am heartily in sympathy. It is true that Mr. Hoover is not the sort of a man whom liberals should support for the Presidency of the United States. His attitude towards public questions is too reactionary. It is also true that we can better afford to lose with Mr. Howe, Senator LaFollette or Mr. Walsh than win with Mr. Hoover. At the same time these facts should not make us unjust to the magnificent work of Mr. Hoover in feeding Europe.

It is true that Mr. Hoover has not expressed any disapproval of the Peace Treaty, but neither on the other hand has he expressed any approval. Had he expressed his approval we all know what would have happened to him. He would have been gently but firmly removed from public life with the result that thousands of Germans and Poles would have starved, and who would have benefited?

I agree with your correspondent that nine-tenths of the arts of the present day arise from "selfish efficiency," but where is there anything selfish about Mr. Hoover's efficiency? In the winter of 1914 he gave up his business and went to Belgium and unostentatiously devoted all his time to feeding the people of that country. It is a significant fact that during the first few years of the war Senator LaFollette was considerably more in the lime light than was Mr. Hoover. We did not hear of Mr. Hoover until he was appointed Food Administrator. He has repeatedly refused decorations from foreign governments on the plea that "Americans do not wear such things." A type of efficiency to which thousands of persons owe their lives can scarcely be described as "selfish."

The real reason why liberals should not support Mr. Hoover rests, it seems to me, on the ground that magnificent as his work is, it savors too much of the old fashioned paternalism. Mr. Hoover has not yet grasped the idea that it is better to let people do things for themselves, even though they make mistakes, than to do things for them. In Soviet Russia, when the Countess Panina was on trial, an old man told about what a noble character she was and how she had him taught to read. "Yes," replied a Bolshevik, "the Countess is indeed a noble character, but if Russia blossomed with noble characters it would make no difference. People ought to be taught to read because it is their *right,* not through the kindness of someone else."

New York City. L. P. EASTMAN.

## Hoover for Postmaster

SIR: I have received a letter from Mr. Ralph Arnold of Los Angeles, asking me to join the Make-Hoover-President Club. This letter I ask leave to answer through the columns of The New Republic.

The reason why I cannot join the Club, nor vote for Mr. Hoover for President is the following:

Among the few definite things for which Mr. Hoover has said that he stands, is *No Nationalization,* and that at a time when the nationalization of, at least, the mines seems the most important, perhaps, of all economic questions now before the country.

Mr. Hoover's great capacity as an administrator is willingly recognized, but as President of the United States we need at this time one who is something more than an administrator—a statesman with imagination and insight, a statesman who stands for constructive political principles both in the domestic and the international field. Such a statesman the country possesses in Senator Hiram Johnson —and I know of none else.

As for Mr. Hoover, there is one place where his eminent ability would bear more fruit than in any other—in the office of Postmaster-General, and the sooner he is appointed to that office, the better for the country. I would join a Make-Hoover-Postmaster-General Club.

AKSEL G. S. JOSEPHSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

## Hoover and the Negro

SIR: I have read with interest the articles in the New Republic on Hoover and the Issues. Encompassing as these issues may seem, I wish to ask if, in all fairness, the problems presented by twelve millions of Negroes do not present an "issue" on which the next President of the United States should at least have an expressed point of view.

The facts of this year of unrest and its attendant ills have not been lost upon the Negro. He wants a "realism" that is militant towards the enforcement of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution, a federal law against lynching, a governmental recognition in a specific way of his desire to serve this country in peace as well as in war, and to have a real share of responsibility of the government of the country that is his and to which he contributes taxes, work and life. Is his a case of so little importance to the wellbeing of the government that it is to be thrown out of court?

The Negro forms more than one-tenth of the population of this country, and no "realism," however blatant, can be of sincere service to the United States of America that does not consider as one of the great issues in American life the just settlement of his account.

L. E. GRAVES.

Raleigh, North Carolina.

## Devil and Deep Sea

SIR: Does not the difference between Wood and Hoover boil down to this? During the next eight years there is likely to be a general strike or a series of strikes for the extension of the worker's power in industry. Wood will jail or shoot every strike leader he can lay his hands on. Hoover will try to send them back to work by promises of arbitration adjustments and a campaign against the high cost of living. Wood or Hoover will be equally futile: why vote for either?

PAUL BLANSHARD.

New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## On American Philosophy

SIR: I shall be grateful for the privilege of correcting two misleading implications which appear in the article, On American Philosophy, in the New Republic for March 17th. To classify Christian Science as one of the various forms of New Thought is quite inaccurate. On the contrary Christian Science is the parent stem from which sprang New Thought; and it may be said that the latter had its origin in an effort to bridge the chasm projected by the former between the spiritual creation and the so-called material world, and which in its later developments has widely diverged from the teachings of Christian Science. Christian Science bears no relation whatever either to Neoplatonism or Theosophy. Reincarnation and Karma, the basic teaching of Theosophy, has no place whatsoever in Christian Science which teaches that God is the only Life, finding expression in the spiritual and perfect creation, including man. This teaching in no wise recognizes the dual being, Spirit contained in a material body.

While the teachings of the early Alexandrian School, known as Neoplatonism, comprise a very wide range of philosophical and religious beliefs there are certain distinctive teachings wholly characteristic which are very far from the tenets of Christian Science. Neoplatonism taught that from divine unity, the source of all things, emanates pure intelligence from which in time emanates "the soul of the world, a creative agent producing the lesser souls of men and animals." Christian Science accepts the account of creation as given in the first chapter of Genesis, that God, infinite Mind, Spirit, creates all as His expression of ideas. This of a necessity does not include a material universe which the earlier philosophy accepts as a fact or entity of creation.

Of Theosophy and Neoplatonism Mrs. Eddy has stated on page 14 of No and Yes, "Theosophy is a corruption of Judaism. This corruption had a renewal of the Neoplatonic philosophy; but it sprang from the Oriental philosophy of Brahmanism, and blends with its magic and enchantments. Theosophy is no more allied to Christian Science than the odor of the upas-tree is to the sweet breath of springtide, or the brilliant coruscations of the northern sky are to solar heat and light."

ALBERT F. GILMORE.

New York City.

## Lincoln and Lenine

SIR: Substitution of the names of certain Muscovite gentlemen, now much in the forefront, and a slight change of geographical names in the quotations from The Education of Henry Adams given below, throw a singularly illuminating light upon the phenomenon of repetition in the process of history:

". . . The world had other persons—such as President Lincoln, Secretary Seward and Commodore Wilkes—for constant and favorite objects of ridicule . . . Everyone waited to see Lincoln and his heirlings disappear in one vast debacle. All conceived that the Washington government would soon crumble . . . The governments and society of Europe . . . regarded the Washington government as dead, and its ministers as nullities.

"London was altogether beside itself on one point, in especial; it created a nightmare of its own, and gave it the shape of Abraham Lincoln. Behind this it placed another demon, if possible more devilish, and called it Mr. Seward. In regard to these two men, English society seemed demented. Defense was useless; explanation was vain; . . . One's best friends were as unreasonable as enemies, for the belief in poor Mr. Lincoln's brutality and Seward's ferocity became dogma of popular faith.

"He, [Thackeray] never doubted that the Federals made a business of harrowing the tenderest feelings of women—particularly of women—in order to punish their opponents. On quite insufficient evidence he burst into violent reproach. 'Had Adams carried in his pocket proofs that the reproach was unjust he would have gained nothing by showing them. At that point Thackeray, and all London society with him needed the nervous relief of expressing emotion; for if Mr. Lincoln was not what they said he was—what were they?"

RARA AVIS.

Washington, D. C.

## A Stately Slot Machine

SIR: In one of our larger Eastern universities where I have the honor (there is little other reward) to teach, there has recently come to a head a problem which has confronted for some time every growing institution for higher education in this country. It is the familiar one of an expanding enrollment without a sufficiently corresponding increase in revenue to pay the faculty a living wage. The trustees, backed by that section of alumni opinion which is called influential, have come out flatly for meeting the emergency by a large increase of tuition fees. It is urged that this method will not only meet the difficulty, but will secure a more "desirable" type of undergraduate, the word "desirable" being interpreted by the only standard which would seem to the average trustee mind to represent a measure of values.

The faculty, on the other hand, has declared squarely for State control and support, with the implication that if attendance must be limited, scholarship should be the deciding factor.

Most of the trustees seem to wish to retain their dignified functions without being willing, in any adequate degree at least, to fulfill the duty for which they were really selected. They seem to visualize themselves as a council of elders, chosen for their wisdom, and charged with the duty of directing the education of youth into "safe" channels; or as a board of censorship, empowered by some occult being to guard vigilantly the purity of the stream of knowledge for which our young men are supposed to be thirsting. It has never appeared to occur to the rich American business man to ask himself honestly what qualifications he possessed for such a role. Probably, like Molière's imitation aristocrat, he feels that "Les gens de qualité savent tout sans avoir jamais rien appris."

From what many of us know of the usual trustee, there is little justification for such a conception. A trustee of a privately controlled institution should really be regarded as a sort of stately slot machine, into which may be fed the necessary amount of honorary degrees, newspaper notices, and other judicious flattery, and which will, in return, let drop the raw material of academic salaries in sufficient and unfailing quantities. Trustees need have no other role. They should leave the selection of ideas to those fitted by training to know something about them.

INSTRUCTOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# National Dangers and National Defence

SIR: Mr. Whittlesey's fair-tempered plea for military training, and your thoughtful editorial opposing it in your issue of March 17th do not touch all the important aspects of the question. He repeats the common error that Norman Angell's "masterly argument" was "unsound in creating the assumption that a thing so unreasonable as war could not recur." I challenge anyone to find in any one of Mr. Angell's half-dozen books any such assumption. Mr. Angell with painful, patient reiteration has maintained that war was bound to come if the mad rivalry of arms continued, but that, under modern conditions, no victor could ever gain as much as he would lose.

Mr. Whittlesey says the problem involves these two questions:

"1. Is war a possible menace? 2. What are the disadvantages of a program for preparedness?" I hold instead that the two problems are: 1. Is an outside attack a probable menace to us? 2. How can real preparedness be created? The militarists' assumption always is that preparedness means merely men, money and munitions. Norman Angell in his wise little book, The Dangers of Half-Preparedness, shows that these are only one-half of the necessities.

The other half is knowledge of policies and motives. It involves definite determination and clear announcement of national policy and knowledge of others' policies. Said Congressman A. S. Gardner: "If Great Britain in July, 1914, had said to Germany 'we shall back up Russia, if you fight her,' there would have been no war."

Without knowledge of policies, the kind and degree of defence needed against danger are incalculable. A war that begins between two nations may drag in the whole world. Germany was prepared, if ever a nation was, to fight two or three nations. She never calculated on fighting twenty.

Preparedness is based on guess-work, unless a government knows certain facts which it never yet has known. These are what permanent policy it will adopt, what its enemies think and how many there will be. Adequate military preparedness is a chimera. Yet preparedness for all likely contingencies we must have. Its elements come not from mines and laboratories. It is a product of psychical forces rather than of explosives.

Mr. Whittlesey complains that we were unprepared for the Civil war. Had we been better prepared, we should have helped the South equally with the North. 135,430 muskets were quietly sent from a northern arsenal to a southern one just before the war. Secretary Floyd disarmed the North to equip the South with ordnance. He sent General Twiggs to Texas who turned over to that state his entire army corps with equipment and stores valued at $4,200,000. Our navy was absolutely adequate, but a southern cabinet officer dispersed it to the four winds of heaven.

In the nature of the case, no nation can be prepared against civil war. Had Great Britain been prepared with 1,000,000 armed men, as Lord Roberts implored her to be over twenty years ago, she would have fought France. History would have been no better, only different, had nations wasted more money on "preparation."

Mr. Whittlesey and you refer to China's quietism and its risks. China's suffering from invasion and abuse could have been prevented without any well-equipped army. What she needed was capital and western science. Given 400,000,000 people who were educated and had command of their resources, their power through the boycott—their favorite weapon—would have sufficed to bring to terms any trading nations that insulted China.

Mr. Whittlesey assumes that our preparedness would give weight to our efforts towards universal reduction of armaments. Whereas, if we, the safest nation in the world, adopt for the first time a system of compulsory military training, every other nation must logically follow suit. We, alone, are protected by two great oceans and have a 4,000 mile border-line that is the safest in the world, because it is unguarded. Our example, following the destruction of German military power, and Great Britain's refusal to have compulsory training, would alarm the world. We have had no foreign war that we did not declare ourselves. There is no reason to suppose that we shall have one.

Whether we enter the League of Nations or not, Japan is pledged to arbitrate every quarrel with us if we demand it.

Our dangers from other sources are so much greater than from war that the latter are tenth-rate in comparison. Up to 1914, tuberculosis annually destroyed literally ten times as many lives as were killed in all our foreign wars. Twelve times as many American citizens perish annually from preventable disease and preventable accident as were slain in the World War. Fire, waste, neglect, intemperance have destroyed more than we spent in the World War. Our greatest defence should be set against our chief dangers.

We have reversed the logic of the situation. Our eyes are focused on the spectacular and we ignore the frightful drains upon our vitality because they are so quiet and continuous.

Mr. Whittlesey admits that military training is expensive. I asked General Wood what it would cost and he replied:

"Those who are opposed to it estimate $700,000,000 annually, and those who favor it say, $350,000,000 to $400,000,000"; i. e. four to five times the amount asked in the Smith-Towner bill for physical training of all children and youth, plus normal school assistance, training of aliens and illiterates and for aid of rural schools—a bill which would provide new mental life for the American people. But it "costs so much," its passage is doubtful.

When occasions of "great national moment arise," as Mr. Whittlesey says, it is to be hoped that we may "face them without bluster and without fear." That was precisely what we did in April, 1917. That "fifty years of preparedness could be provided by what we spent in the war just past," seems to me both irrelevant and untrue. One-fiftieth of the whole amount—say $500,000,000—could have controlled in the last fifty years the output of the world's press and universities if it had been in the hands of real statesmen who were working for peace. It could have prevented the false information, the twisted logic, and the ignorance of economic laws which created the deep seated causes which led to the World War.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Boston, Massachusetts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Chekhov's Letters

*Letters of Anton Chekhov, translated by Constance Garnett. New York: The Macmillan Co.*

ANTON Chekhov was a man peculiarly averse to magniloquence. He belonged to, and was typical of a post-eloquent period in which national rhetoric had to be led into the fresh air and cooled off. But though rhetoric, including the rhetoric of charity, was abhorrent to Chekhov, he never once seems to have made the prime mistake of allowing his distaste for grand utterance to bite into the realities which grand utterance falsifies. He kept hold of those realities through every phase of his life. This is one of the interesting revelations of his letters.

In these pages nearly every phase of his career is exhibited by his own hand—guided by his excellent translator Mrs. Garnett who has chosen these out of 1890 letters published by Chekhov's family. The great landscape of Russia is a continuous and exciting background to his words and feelings, whether he is scanning the sandy Volga (which often bored him) or shivering on the banks of the Irtysh or peering down a verst to the marvelous depths of Lake Baikal. Amiable Tatars he meets, and the likeable Jews of Siberia, and the good-natured Chinese, and the gold-miners of the Amur with their open-handed liberalism and their confident youth. Beside these, and the hellish penal settlement of Sahalin, he writes much from Europe—his dazzled vision of Venice, his plunge into Monte Carlo, his disgust with it, his discovery of architecture in Vienna, his discovery of neckties in Rome. But while the background is nearly always diverting, especially when he is home in the province of Moscow and living his busy life at Melihovo, the man himself is ever so much more fascinating than his scenery. His 1890 letters would not be a line too much.

He enjoyed life. In his stories the salad of life includes a fair proportion of grit. There he softens nothing, omits no irritability, leaves out no swamp, no tired or dreary day. But in his letters life does not victimize him personally. He rides with good hands and a temper light and gay and even radiant. Only in certain big emergencies, such as the famine crisis and the cholera crisis and the Sahalin expedition and the failure of The Seagull and his conflict with Suvorin about Dreyfus, does his responsive and responsible spirit reveal its true strength. Of course his tone about enjoying life, and even his enjoyment, are not even. The man is not a machine. Sometimes he is depressed, exasperated, hunted. Sometimes, even often, he has "the extreme excitability, the feeling of guilt, the liability to become exhausted [that] are purely Russian." But before he was thirty he reveals maturity. "One wants to be mature—that is one thing; and for another the *feeling of personal freedom* is essential, and that feeling has only recently begun to develop in me. I used not to have it before; its place was successfully filled by my frivolity, carelessness and lack of respect for my work." This sense of freedom, of healthy self-possession, Chekhov does give above everything. And his witty playfulness flowers out of it all through his later letters like the blossoms of spring.

He is thoroughly unaffected. When he is in need of money, when he has spat blood, when he has haemorrhoids, when he sees the awful dresses of the Berlin women, he speaks his mind. But this lack of affectation is not the simple charm of the wild man. He is not a wild man, a happy exploitative barbarian. Chekhov is unaffected because of his good humor, fine feeling and lancing intelligence; he has too much straight sense and honest medical directness to disrespect facts. He is fresh and original not by violence but by swift discernment. And his distaste for pretentiousness and lack of restraint, even in Dostoevsky or Gorky, is one of his strongest traits.

But because unaffected and because easily accessible to the demands of other people, Chekhov took a long time to admit his obligations toward his own talent. In 1886, when he was twenty-six years old, he received a strong letter from the writer D. V. Grigorovitch, and his frank answer to that letter, acknowledging that he was unjust to himself, suspicious and morbidly sensitive, is one of the most touching of all. Soon he is writing Madame Kiselyov, "In Russia there are now two unattainable heights: Mount Elborus and myself." He continued to laugh at himself. ("People borrow money from me and don't pay it back, they take my books, they waste my time . . . . Blighted love is the one thing that is missing.") But the courage to accept himself and his talent was forthcoming. When he was sixteen he had proudly written his young brother, "You recognize your insignificance? Recognize it before God: perhaps, too, in the presence of beauty, intelligence, nature, but not before men." This pride stood him in good stead. He continued to write much too fast—three stories a week, a story at a sitting, and so on. He continued to pour out energy as district doctor and literary host and head of the household and guardian of the poor. But already he was actively and warmly in touch with his best contemporaries and colleagues, Tolstoy and Korolenko and Pleshtcheyev and Grigorovitch and the rest. He had developed his candid attitude toward his art and toward life, and in being considerate of every claim on him, genuine, unstinting, he was simply holding to that civilized charity which was the core of his Russian being.

The unfortunate fact was, however, that he did not and would not take his tuberculosis seriously. As early as 1886 he speaks of spitting blood. He had begun writing in 1879, the year he went to Moscow University to study medicine, and before he was thirty he was not only supporting his parents and his sister but he had become premier jeune homme of Russian creative literature, author of several plays, close friend of Suvorin (editor of Novoye Vremya). By 1896 he had done The Seagull. In 1897 he was diagnozed as seriously ill with tuberculosis and sent to Nice. From then, on and off till 1904, he was a sick man. He wanted to live in Moscow but was forced to stay a great deal in the Crimea. In 1901 came his marriage to Olga Knipper, a leading actress in the Art Theatre of Moscow. From then till 1904 he refused to conserve or miser his life. In 1903 he finished The Cherry Orchard and was busy with its production. This great success closed the twenty-fifth year of his literary activity. He went to Germany, very ill, in June 1904, and, believing himself to be on the way to another recovery, died in July.

In so spending himself Chekhov sounds reckless, but his recklessness must be estimated in relation to his temperament. In planning his amazing journey to the convict settlement of Sahalin, which involved driving 3000 miles through the spring torrents and great wastes of Siberia, Chekhov wrote Suvorin: "I imagine the journey will be six months of incessant hard work, physical and mental, and that is essential for me, for I am a Little Russian and have already begun to be lazy. I must take myself in hand." There was a substratum of conscientiousness and ambition and fear in him from which he drew energy.

"I shall go by steamer to the Pacific," he writes his brother from Irkutsk, "where the first thing I shall do is to have a bath and eat oysters." "My ideal," he teases Lika Mizinov, "is to be idle and love a plump girl." His letters are full of such teasing and such gaiety, with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

glimpses of himself in all sorts of odd corners. "They put me, the servant of God, into a basketwork chaise and drove me with two horses; one sits in the basket like a goldfinch, looking at God's world and thinking of nothing." But, nominally "the lightest and most frivolous" of writers, Chekhov kept accounts between himself and every personality with whom he dealt. This respect for personality and concentration on its realities is a central part of his spirit.

"I don't believe in our educated class," he wrote to Orlov in 1899, "which is hypocritical, false, hysterical, badly educated and indolent. I don't believe in it even when it is suffering and complaining, for its oppressors come from its own entrails. I believe in individual people, I see salvation in individual personalities scattered here and there all over Russia—educated people as well as peasants —they have strength though they are few."

The "oppressors" that come from one's own entrails—those were real to Chekhov, and all through his life he helped people against them. This was the quality of his charity. Whether he was visiting Sahalin or addressing Maxim Gorky or combatting Tolstoy's fixed ideas or fighting for Dreyfus, he had in his charity something of his medical passion. And to refuse such help, to fail even to answer the claims of a single letter, went against Chekhov's grain. So, without pretentiousness, he gave to life every ounce of his being.

His letters are accordingly the letters of a man without calculativeness or envy—untrammelled, unpremeditative, unspoiled. To read him, when he is favorable or the reverse, when he praises Tolstoy or dismisses Eduard Rod or admires Gogol or analyzes Bourget, is to feel the same pleasure that he himself had in sea-bathing: "Sea-bathing is so nice that when I got into the water I began to laugh for no reason at all." His personality, so unforced, is like that; and when his letters stop, it is as if a heart stops, he is so palpable.

F. H.

# The History of India

*The History of Aryan Rule in India, by E. B. Havell. New York: Frederick Stokes & Co.*

*The Oxford History of India, by Vincent Smith. New York: Oxford University Press.*

*A History of the Sikhs, by J. D. Cunningham, a new revised edition by Mr. H. L. O. Garrett. New York: Oxford University Press.*

ONE of the lessons taught by the great war is that what had so far been passing for "history" was more or less nationalistic and imperialistic propaganda. Almost all histories were found to be tainted with partisanship. It was found that facts had been distorted, omitted, suppressed, repressed, or exaggerated to support theories which originated in the desire of writers to glorify their own country at the expense of others. If that is true of the histories of free countries, it is even more so of countries subject to foreign rule. It is a common practice with all imperialistic races to base their claim to rule others on the assumption of their own superiority to the ruled. It is also essential for the continued success of their plan to inoculate the subject people with a belief in their incapacity to rule themselves. When the British began to write histories of India they started with the same kind of assumptions and presumptions. The histories taught in British Indian schools are not free from this defect. The Hindu and Mohammedan students have for about four or five generations been fed on the "barbarities" of their ancestors and the cruelties as well as crudities of their former governments. Early in the nineteenth century the material for a systematic history of ancient India was very scanty. There were few Englishmen who knew Indian languages sufficiently well to use them for purposes of history. The Hindus never busied themselves with writing political history. It was a matter of indifference to them as to what king or queen or chief ruled, what became of him, how many battles he fought and how many he won or lost. What mattered most were the serious problem of life and death, of body and soul, of law and literature, of art and science. On these subjects they left abundant, rather voluminous, material, but the English historians of India had no access to that material and it was not until late in the nineteenth century that it became available to them in translations or even in the original. The European ignorance of India's past, early in the nineteenth century was so colossal as to make honest James Mill (father of John Stuart) make many stupid and obviously untenable statements about Hindu or Mohammedan history. Since then many histories of India have been written and promulgated. Some of the statements made in these books are obviously dishonest, stupid and inaccurate. The literature on the history of India is still growing and much agreeable light is being thrown on Indian life and culture in pre-British days. The Oriental scholars of Germany, France, Great Britain and the United States have contributed much to European knowledge of ancient India. The Archaeological Department of the Government of India has also done much commendable work, but the most valuable work in this line has just been started by Indian scholars themselves. A really complete and perfect history of India has yet to be written and that must come from the pen of a native based on authorities unimpeachable and incontrovertible.

The history of India is usually divided into three periods: I. The Hindu Period; II. The Mohammedan Period; III. The British Period. On the first of these periods the bulky volume written by Mr. Havell is by far the best and the most impartial of all so far written by the English. His narrative deals from the earliest times up to the end of Akbar's reign, thus including more than half of the Mussalman period. The general conclusions which Mr. Havell has arrived at may be thus summarized.

(1) "There can be no true history of India which separates politics from religion." This probably is true of Christian Europe and Moslem Middle East also.

(2) "The freedom and general happiness attained by the people of Great Britain with the help of Parliamentary institutions and the richest revenues of the world can hardly be compared with that which Indians within the Aryan pale enjoyed both before and after the fifth century A. D. The Indo-Aryan Constitution, built up by the highest intelligence of the people upon the basis of the Village Communities and not wrung from unwilling warlords and landlords by century long struggles and civil war, secured to the Indian peasant proprietor not only ownership of land, but very considerable powers of self-government." Chap. XII.

(3) Comparing the "Slavery of modern Industrialism" with the caste system of the Hindus Mr. Havell remarks:

"The cooperative trade and craft guilds of India helped the workman to enjoy life, gave him self-respect and fostered his technical skill, and at the same time served religiously the interests of the State. The student of Indian history may also be led to consider whether the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, constituted as it now is on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more or less empirical lines, is really more efficient as political machinery than was the philosophic scheme of Indo-Aryan policy, in which the common law of the land, formulated by the chosen representatives of the people, had a religious as well as a legal sanction, and represented the highest power of the State."

This paragraph is commended to Professor Ramsay Muir of Manchester who thinks that the conception of law and justice was not known to the ancient Hindus, and who makes some very chauvinistic statements in the New Europe.

(4) "Indo-Aryan statesmen did not find that the illiteracy of the Indian masses prevented them from taking a considerable part in the management of their own affairs, for before the days of the printing press and modern journalism there were in India other means of instructing the people and a highly organized educational system which, judged by results, was far more efficient than the present one. Until British statesmen divest themselves of judging Indian things by Western standards they will never see them in the right perspective. Indo-Aryan statesmen were not afraid of allowing the masses, *including women,* to vote, on account of their illiteracy—for the most learned and representative Indians were often illiterate in the European sense."

Mr. Vincent Smith's history of the Hindu period is excellent but not entirely free from racial bias. It is gratifying to note that the labors of Indian scholars have led him to change some of his former opinions. We hope he will live to change much more.

His narrative of the Mohammedan period is badly disfigured by the anxiety he displays on almost every page of his book to emphasize and exaggerate the demerits and brutalities of the Moslem rule. He gives quite a disproportionate space to the character sketches of the Moslem sovereigns enlarging on their defects freely and praising their virtues and merits only very reluctantly. But it is in his narrative of British rule that he betrays his partisan spirit fully. This part of his book is very meagre, obscure, incomplete, unconvincing and superficial. An admirer of Lord Curzon, he cannot lay aside his Anglo-Indian bias of the service in which he spent his lifetime, by giving an almost misleading picture of the achievements and failures of British rule in India. The reader may well imagine the character of his effort to picture modern India without even once mentioning the Brahmo Samaj, the Arya Samaj, the Indian National Congress, the Moslem League and their respective founders. A history of modern India, however brief and sketchy, which omits to mention Gokhale, Ranade, Tilak and others who have contributed to its making can only be called the play of Hamlet without Hamlet. Mr. Vincent Smith's frame of mind can be best judged from a letter of commendation he has written to a Hindu defender of the Caste system. He says "all my sympathies are with conservative Indian institutions purified from the grossest abuses which disfigure them."

Mr. Cunningham's History of the Sikhs is a reprint (revised and somewhat abridged) of a famous work, one of the best of its kind, written by a military officer in the employ of the East India Company to whom truth and honesty mattered more than racial pride or the approval of his countrymen. Captain Cunningham belonged to that galaxy of early Anglo-Indian military officers who combined the prowess of the sword with elegance of pen and noble-mindedness of heart. Colonel Todd and Major Evans Bell were two others of that class whose names we can recall readily. Captain Cunningham's honest statement of the dealings of the East India Company was rewarded by his degradation in the service. The nature of the revision done by the present editor may be gathered from the following sentence which we take from the introductory remarks relating to Chap. VIII.

"From this point of the story the partiality of the author causes many of his statements to be viewed with suspicion. In his eyes the war represents a national tide of self-preservation rising against the ever encroaching power of England. Such was far from being the case, and very different motives actuated the corrupt administration of Lahore . . .

"The author gives a somewhat turgid description of the battles of the war—indeed, the language in the account of the battle of Sobraon reminds one of the story of the battle in the poems of Mr. Robert Montgomery—and he concludes his narrative by some general remarks upon English policy in India. From the latter I have removed some passages which are not only injudicious, but which have been stultified by the march of events."

The spirit of revising Indian history with the underlying motive of whitewashing the British policy of the East India Company regime is rather common in these days. The statements made by James Mill, Torrens, Cunningham, Tad Evans Bell, Grant Duff and others are all undergoing a process of analytic examination always ending in the conclusion that the aspersions cast by the writers on the early British administrators were exaggerated. Professor Muir has in a recent book lauded Warren Hastings to the skies, and Lord Curzon tried to erect a statue to Clive. History is thus losing much of its value as a record of true facts. It is more or less propaganda, sometimes imperialistic, sometimes materialistic. The reader of Indian histories written by Englishmen, or on the authority of the latter, may well remember this fact when trying to understand the nature of British conquest of India and of British rule in India.

LAJPAT RAI.

# The Origin of Consciousness

*The Origin of Consciousness, by Charles Augustus Strong. London: The Macmillan Co.*

SOME fifteen years ago, Professor Charles Augustus Strong rippled the calm surface of the philosophic world by a book with the fascinating title, Why the Mind has a Body. Had he been minded to give to his new book a parallel title, he would have called it, not The Origin of Consciousness, but Why the Mind has Consciousness. As a matter of fact, both the title and the sub-title of this new book give a very misleading description of its contents. True, Dr. Strong opens his argument with the solemn questions, "Whence comes this which we call consciousness?" "Whence comes the soul of the babe when he begins to have one?" True, he reminds himself at intervals of his purpose to give an "evolutionary" answer to these questions, and to show "that the mind is a natural product, as much as the brain or as a plant in the soil." But, in fact, all that he says in this book on these points could be compressed on the proverbial half-sheet of note paper. It amounts to this: the origin of consciousness, by which term Dr. Strong means knowing or the cognitive function, is to be explained biologically. Consciousness has evolved as a means of adjusting organisms to their environment, of securing differential behavior in a highly differentiated world. The origin of mind, on the other hand, i. e. of the "psyche," or "ego which knows," is to be explained metaphysically,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a context of "panpsychism." This is the theory that the substance of the universe is "mind-stuff"; that what to perception appears as body is really, on its "inner" side, soul. The physical is in last analysis psychical. It is because matter is really mind, that minds can appear to have evolved out of it: "A psychic ego can come by evolution only out of a psychic world."

The reader may judge for himself whether this theory really answers the question concerning the beginning of the soul in the babe. At any rate, it is clear that Dr. Strong uses "evolution" in a highly Pickwickian sense. To say that everything in the world is made of mind-stuff is the reverse of a theory of the evolution of mind. For mind-stuff, on this view, is ultimate and exists as long as anything exists at all. There can be no question of its origin. Instead we are led to ask, and ask in vain, such questions as these: Why, and how, did the undifferentiated cosmic mind-stuff split up into individual psyches and egos? Why did it differentiate itself into different kinds or levels of psyche, such as human and animal souls? Why do psyches appear to each other as bodies? Why, if bodies are really psychical, do most of them—the whole "inorganic" and "inanimate" world—appear to us as if they were soulless and purely material? To all these questions Dr. Strong gives no answer at all. As for consciousness, is mind-stuff everywhere conscious? Apparently not, for consciousness is said to have evolved because organisms need it. Presumably, then, inorganic things do not need it. Yet does not the very distinction between what is living and what is non-living disappear if the latter, like the former, is psychical? Dr. Strong's theory depends upon a kind of philosophical double bookkeeping. One account is kept in biological terms of organism and environment for the benefit of scientific customers. The other, to suit the taste of philosophers, is kept in metaphysical terms of mind-stuff as the universal substance. It is easy to say that we have here "one existence apprehended from two different points of view," and Dr. Strong can quote some eminent philosophers who have said the same thing. But, in fact, the identification is nothing but a bold dictum, nor is it in any way made intelligible why what is really psychical should masquerade for its own perception as physical. If Dr. Strong does not boggle at this, why does he boggle at the evolution of mind from matter?

The truth is that Dr. Strong is much more concerned with the nature of consciousness than with its origin. Not how it has evolved, but what it is, is the real burden of his argument. The vigorous polemics of which his book is full are almost all directed against rival theories of consciousness. And what a fighter he is, to be sure! On idealists and objectivists (alias neo-realists) his impartial flail descends with resounding blows. He does not fear even the redoubtable Bertrand Russell who is bidden to remember that logicians are not depositories of truth, but only guardians of the instruments of truth-seeking—menders of nets, rather than themselves fishermen. Our American realists are demolished by the charge that they "hypostatize essences," and thereby "convert logical into ontological entities." As for the poor idealists, pre-Kantian and post-Kantian—why, Darwinism and physiological psychology have made an end of them, or, rather, would have made an end of them, if only they were not too much behind the times to take notice. In fact, all metaphysical systems are vitiated by initial fallacies, except one, and this one is—need we say it?—Dr. Strong's own. It alone makes a tidy pattern of all the pieces of the philosophical puzzle. Like Father Christmas, Dr. Strong has a gift in his bag for every one in the philosophical nursery. To good little realists he offers the desire of their hearts: independent yet knowable objects; to physicists, material things; to psychologists, sensations and images, feelings and volitions; to logicians, universals; to idealists, the "givenness of essences"; to metaphysicians, mind-stuff. Do you have a fancy for instincts? Here you are: "We are led to affirm the existence of objects by a powerful instinct." This, incidentally, demolishes the skeptic—the one naughty boy in the nursery for whom Dr. Strong's bag contains nothing. The one thing needful, if you would qualify for grace, is to forswear forever, in emphatic italics, *"the great fundamental illusion, the fallacy of fallacies,* [which] *consists in overlooking the vehicular nature of knowledge and mistaking the essence for the object."*

This brings us back to Dr. Strong's theory of consciousness. The behavior of consciousness, on the philosophical dissecting-table, is notoriously scandalous. Nothing, you would think, could be more fundamental or more familiar. Yet nothing is more illusive and harder to pin down for inspection. When you see a color, do you see also your seeing? Are you aware of seeing as distinct from what you see? When you are conscious, are you also conscious of being conscious? If so, what exactly is it that you are conscious of, when you are conscious of being conscious? Distinguish, in short, consciousness from its objects and try to inspect it by itself: is there, or is there not, anything to inspect? A pretty problem, which has led some to say that consciousness is there, but is diaphanous, and can be only enjoyed not contemplated, whilst others say that there is nothing there and that consciousness is only a name for that cross-section of the object-world to which a given creature's central nervous system selectively responds. Here is Dr. Strong's opportunity. The first thing to do, he holds, is to distinguish mind-stuff, of which introspection furnishes a veracious sample in the psyche, i. e., in the stream of each one's sensations, images, and feelings, from consciousness. The next is to recognize consciousness, not as a uniform characteristic of the psychical, but as an aspect of the function of cognition, i. e., as the use made of certain psychical elements in knowing. The third step is to recognize cognition as vehicular: in knowing we use psychic states as symbols for objects, and "what we really mean by 'consciousness' is this relation of symbolism as exercised by a psychic state." This use of psychic states as symbols is identical with the affirmation of objects as existing, which in turn is identical with the instinctive responses of the organism to the environment. Sensations act as cues for behavior, and behavior takes the existence of objects for granted. The organism "intends" the object. At the same time, fourthly, a psychic state, e. g., a sensation of color, can thus function as a vehicle for the perception of an object only because it can be analyzed into the "givenness" of an "essence." Let it be a sensation of green: then the greenness is an essence or universal—not an existing object but only its "logical shadow." In dreams, we have nothing but given-essences, for no real objects then exist or are perceived. It is only by affirmation, by the symbolic use of the sensation, that we refer the given-essence to an existence and thus perceive and know a real thing. Hocus-pocus, do you say? Softly—it is the privilege of philosophers to make familiar things look unfamiliar by the witchery of their technical terms. And Dr. Strong is a master of the art.

There can be no doubt that Dr. Strong has written a most stimulating and exhilarating book. It will occasion fresh ripples on the surface of the philosophical pond.

R. F. A. H.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Morass East of the Rhine

*Across the Blockade, by Henry Noel Brailsford. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe.*

WHAT is going to come out of Europe east of the Rhine nobody knows. You may talk, if you like, of the immense recuperative power exhibited in the past by peoples apparently utterly crushed; you may hope that within the boundaries laid down by the Peace Treaty the same kind of stable national economic states will arise as served before the war among the premises of political thinking. You must confess, however, that progress in that direction is not encouraging. There is so little that is cheerful to say about the internal condition of the new states created or enlarged by the war, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugoslavia and Rumania, that our press says practically nothing about it at all. We know well enough that none of those governments makes ends meet, we know that they are trying to do business with a currency as degraded as our own at the time when "not worth a Continental" expressed the final term of worthlessness without expense of profanity. That is about all we know, or shall know, until we have accounted to ourselves for the time that has elapsed since the great breakdown of national purposes registered in the armistice.

Brailsford's book helps to fill just this need. It is a record of what he saw in four months of travel through Austria, Hungary, Poland and Germany in the early part of last year. He was in Hungary during the Bela Kun regime; he was in Vienna during the abortive Communistic rising of April; in Poland, while there was a lull in pogrom making, he saw enough to illuminate the sufferings of the Jews already endured or yet to come. He was in Germany when the peace terms became known. Few men have had better opportunities to observe what was going on deep in the souls of peoples shaken out of all habits of concealment by great crises, and there is no keener observer living than Brailsford. What he has to say is worth thinking over.

At the time of which Brailsford writes the peoples of Central Europe, friends and foes alike, were suffering terribly under the continuance of the Allied blockade. Germany and Austria were being subjected to a regimen more drastic than that of the war blockade, since relations with Scandinavia were cut off. The disarmed Magyars were being set upon by Czecho-Slovaks, Jugoslavs and Rumanians, not without the approval of the Allied architects of continental alliances. Germany was sunk in an abyss of despair; Polish nationalism was winning for itself a little evanescent warmth from the fires of anti-Semitism, deliberately kindled by the Dmowski faction which the western democracies delighted most to honor. Nowhere was there any really generous faith animating the masses of the people, except for a brief moment in Hungary, before the Allies crushed Bela Kun and turned the hapless Magyars over to the counter-revolution. How ghastly the impression left upon a sensitive observer like Brailsford may be inferred from the following:

"Another decade of wars and blockades and revolutions, and every relic of learning and humanity may be swept away from the Rhine to the Volga. There must have been, when the barbarians surged over the Roman provinces in the twilight centuries lonely villas, left standing amid the ruins of the Empire, in which old men survived, conning Greek manuscripts in pillaged rooms, while the Goths enjoyed their wealth. . . . As the months of desolation lengthened into years, these old men hoped for the return of civilization, and dying prayed that their sons would live to see it. Their sons lived like barbarians, dimly remembering the interrupted studies of their youth. Their sons' sons were barbarians born."

But must we have a decade of war and blockade and revolution, to usher in a new series of Dark Ages? Brailsford does not affirm this, but neither has he the least confidence in the present settlement. What war and the blockade did to Germany was to break, not only the militaristic spirit, the criminal lust for imperial power of the ruling caste, but the spirit by which scientist and artist, mechanic and laborer are sustained in their creative efforts. The Peace Treaty perpetuated the evil. After its terms became known, apathy and disbelief became fixed upon the people, distrust of themselves, distrust of all other peoples. Their new constitution seemed a pedant's exercise. There was revolutionary desire enough, but not revolutionary will, and the play of forces in Germany resolved itself into an unstable equilibrium between Noske's machine guns and the power of the strike and sabotage. Poland, Jugoslavia, Czecho-Slovakia and Rumania, enriched by German, Magyar and Bulgarian spoils to which they were not entitled, found themselves committed to a dependence on France. "A small state ceases to be independent when it has wronged a neighbor; it must thereafter subordinate itself to a protector." And when the wrong consists in the appropriation of territory, there is a perverse natural law that compels it to thrust the wrong continually deeper. For there is a border population to be harried. But is not that population protected by the League of Nations? The League, as Brailsford sees it, is nothing but a Grand Alliance to insure the fruits of victory; and when did an alliance ever control the internal policy of an ally? "From an ally one wants an army, not virtue. While the League remains a militant alliance against the Germans and Bolsheviks, it will achieve nothing for the Polish Jews, or for any other minority." There has been abundant confirmation, since, of this pessimistic formula.

Central Europe has gone through hell. It has many more miseries to go through before it can arrive at a state where civilized living is possible. For that the war lusts of Central Europe were primarily responsible. They have been mostly burnt out. A year ago there were intelligent men who were confident that the German and Magyar militarists would soon be back in the saddle, to lead their eager peoples in a war of revenge. But the peoples east of the Rhine are disillusioned of militarism. They can not be led eagerly to any war, whatever its cause. That is a gain which Brailsford seems not to take sufficiently into account.

For the prolongation of the miseries of Central Europe through the interminable armistice period, for the purpose of making the vanquished accept not a good peace but a bad one, the Allied diplomats at Paris were to blame. But the consequence of that is that the peoples west of the Rhine also are disillusioned. Our cause of war was white, our enemies' cause was black, but the peace the diplomats made was at best gray. And the general recognition of this fact has terribly discredited the leadership that forges plans of military alliance and imperial aggrandizement. Is that not also a gain that Brailsford has overlooked? The civilization of the pre-war period has been shaken and fissured by the war and the peace. But politically just the most important fact of that civilization was the blind faith in which the peoples surrendered to their leaders the power to play with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Philip Gibbs' NEW BOOK

*——IN WHICH HE TELLS WHAT THE CENSOR FORBADE——*

# NOW IT CAN BE TOLD

Cecil Roberts writes in the **New York Times Book Review:** "This volume marks the close of that great work done by Mr. Philip Gibbs as a chronicler of war. It is a wonderful close, and a public tired of war books must not make the mistake of neglecting this, which has a frankness, a truth and a stern reality never before shown in all the literature of the war. Years hence it will survive as the greatest record of four terrible years, a record which is great literature and history, terrible in its unsparing truth, its majesty, its horror, its candor. . . . It will make Philip Gibbs many powerful enemies, but it will place him among the immortals. . . . It is 500 pages compounded of terrible courage, crass stupidity, foul horror and searing beauty crushed out of the heart of men. . . . The frank statement of all those reservations which every war correspondent had to make during his long labor. Reading it is like getting Gibbs alone."

So great has been the demand for this book that three large editions were exhausted **before the date of publication.** Another large printing is now on press and orders are being filled as rapidly as possible. Get this book at your bookseller's today, or leave your order with him. "The greatest book of the war"—by the war correspondent who was "worth an army corps to England"; the man for whose daily articles the entire English-speaking world waited; a book in which he tells all he could not tell then—

**NOW IT CAN BE TOLD**

**By PHILIP GIBBS.**

***Frontispiece, Crown 8vo, Cloth, $3.00***

# *Czernin's* IN THE WORLD WAR

Count Czernin is one of the great figures of the World War, and this record has the intense interest of any frank revelation by a man who has been on the "inside" of great events. In addition it sets forth the tragic story of the part played by Austria as the pawn of Germany's ambition for world dominance.

It presents documents, never before available to Americans—confidential reports containing amazing predictions which were laughed at by the court—predictions which were fulfilled completely.

And just as clearly and logically as he analyzed war situations, he now prophesies an age of which the World War was only one phase—the opening event, perhaps not the most important.

The dire misfortune of Austria has given Czernin, probably her greatest leader, a vision of the new order that is to come. His book is one of the half-dozen books of the World War which will appeal to thinking men and women as a book which must be read.

**IN THE WORLD WAR**

**By Count Ottokar Czernin.**

***$4.00***

# IMPORTANT NEW HARPER BOOKS

## THE INSIDE STORY OF THE PEACE CONFERENCE

**By DR. E. J. DILLON**

"A work which undoubtedly will live after all the other books written on the same subject shall be forgotten," writes the Princess Radziwill in **The Philadelphia Public Ledger;** and continues: "Dr. Dillon is the St. Simon of the twentieth century, and the volume which he has just produced will equal in value for the future historian the memoirs of the French nobleman." **Third edition. Post 8vo. Cloth. $2.50.**

## MY QUARTER CENTURY OF AMERICAN POLITICS

**By CHAMP CLARK**

A fascinating story of one of the most prominent and best liked men in American political history of our times, which will appeal to readers of all shades of political belief. This book is not only interesting, but highly important as a permanent record of our generation. **Crown 8vo. Cloth. Illustrated. 2 vols. $6.00.**

## LUDENDORFF'S OWN STORY

**By GEN. ERICH von LUDENDORFF**

"The most authoritative and comprehensive survey of the war that has yet appeared," says Herbert Sidebotham in the Atlantic Monthly. Written from the actual records of the German general staff, this is the first inside story of the war as Germany fought it. **Illustrated. Maps. Two vols. $7.50.**

## ALSACE IN RUST AND GOLD

**By EDITH O'SHAUGHNESSY**

Edith O'Shaughnessy spent those thirteen historic days before the signing of the armistice in that corner of Alsace reconquered from Germany; a time when "the high-colored beauty of Alsace" burned with an added glory, because victory and repatriation were certain; and this is her record, a book of rare beauty of style and feeling. **Cloth. Illus. Crown 8vo. $2.00.**

## RUSSIA AS AN AMERICAN PROBLEM

**By JOHN SPARGO**

Mr. Spargo sees Russia not merely as a vast problem, but as a vast opportunity, too. He is not a Bolshevist; but for the thinker he clears the haze of controversy about Bolshevism with his shrewd analysis. **Crown 8vo. Cloth. $2.25.**

## A WORLD REMAKING

**By CLARENCE W. BARRON**

The key-word to the great problem of reconstruction is money. The author in this keen analysis of the world situation to-day, shows the dramatic role played by finance, and how our problems, from the Russian situation to international competition in shoes and machinery, are problems of finance. No business man can afford to be otherwise than a close student of this book. **Crown 8vo. Cloth. $1.75.**

***EST. 1817*** **HARPER & BROTHERS** ***NEW YORK***


LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diplomatic intrigue and war. And of all the elements of the old civilization, that faith is the element that has been most shattered. It need no longer lie like an adamantine barrier against the spirit of international good will.

ALVIN JOHNSON.

## State Control

*The Limits of State Industrial Control: A Symposium on the Present Situation and How to Meet it, edited by Huntly Carter. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co.*

THE snippets of opinion which Mr. Huntly Carter has gathered into his new symposium teach little about the problem of state control over industry. For the unpointed loquacity of most of the replies the vagueness of Mr. Carter's questions was no doubt partly to blame. He asked a number of representative public persons:

"1. What in your opinion will be the situation immediately after the war as regards State Control? 2. What in your view is the limitation of State Control to be maintained? 3. What in your view is the best policy of control to be pursued in the higher interests of commerce, trade and industry?" Such a questionnaire did not so much stimulate a discussion as inflict a reaction test, and the experiment lost much of its value because Mr. Carter failed to annotate the answers with their reaction times.

The forty-one contributors represent forty-one separate facets of England's governmental, industrial, and sociological mind. Yet if Mr. Carter had taken the trouble to plot their replies a certain regularity might have been discovered in their responses. At one end are the statesmen and commercialists who want control to end at the earliest moment in order that free play may be given again to a smothered and protestant individualism. At the other end are Mr. Emil Davies and Mr. Bernard Shaw, who desire that state control should be indefinitely expanded and strengthened in the interest of the commonwealth. Between them is the main body whose opinions on state control have reduced the problem to an experimentally verifiable "more or less." This heterogeneous majority see that state control is a method, not an end, and accordingly they tend to side alternately with the great industrialists who demand governmental aid in securing supplies and markets, or with the guild socialists who have not entirely lost sight of the fact that the state must have some general disposition of the product and the usufruct of industry. No inquiry into the problem of state control can be steadily illuminated until a detailed history of the war experiment has been written. Until such a common datum of reference has been created the best of symposiums must prove intellectually little better than a Barmecide feast.

L. M.

## Contributors

PAUL ROSENFELD is a graduate of Yale and the author of various critical articles on music and literature.

WINTHROP D. LANE is a graduate of University of Michigan. He is an associate editor of The Survey and a specialist in prison reform, child welfare and educational work.


**THE NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH**

wishes to award six fellowships of $2000 each for the academic year 1920-21, to put trained workers into the field of direct investigation. Business trends, trade unionism, labor statistics, production and distribution of goods, relation between production costs and selling costs, and the distribution of incomes in the United States are typical of the fields of research in which the school desires to use these fellowships. To this end the school **asks contributions of $5 and up,** which may be sent to the Treasurer, *Wesley Clair Mitchell,* The New School for Social Research, 465 West 23rd Street, New York.

**SUMMER INSTITUTES IN JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE CONDUCTED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE FEDERATED JEWISH CHARITIES OF BOSTON**

*Maurice B. Hexter—Executive Director*

The Federated Jewish Charities of Boston, Mass., announces a series of seven intensive training courses of three weeks each, for Jewish communal workers and volunteers, from July 6 to 27.

Institutes, covering *basic principles and methods, visits to a selected group of social agencies of Boston,* and *concentrated field work* will be offered in the following fields: Child Welfare, Delinquency; Family Case Work; Recreation; Health and Medical Social Service; Social Research and Statistics; and Jewish Education. The Institutes will be in general charge of social workers of the highest professional standing.

Special accommodations will be provided for out-of-town students.

**For details as to dates, courses, fees, etc., address Maurice B. Hexter, 25 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.**

**PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE FORUM**
COOPER UNION, 8 P.M.
TUESDAY, APRIL 13th:
DR. J. HOWARD MELISH lectures on
"Castes and Forecasts."
FRIDAY, APRIL 16th:
EVERETT DEAN MARTIN lectures on
"The Social Philosophy of the Great Individualists."
The social dream of a modern realist.
A LECTURE ON BERTRAM RUSSELL


LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED